

AN ANALYSIS OF LEADER BEHAVIOR OF  
SELECTED COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION COORDINATORS  
IN FLORIDA

by

Albert C. Linwood, Ocala, Florida

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1977

## Recommendations

After completing this study, I have been very satisfied by my educational journey. My three-year tenure at the University of Illinois brought me to contact with many truly outstanding people who added a great deal to my professional growth and experiences.

A truly special thank goes to my wife, Sherry, for the strength and support she provided. In addition, I would like to express my love for my two daughters and apologize to my parents and my.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 HISTORICAL OF THE PROBLEMS	2
3 THEORETICAL AND LITERATURE REVIEW	3
4 THE PROBLEM FOR THE STUDY	4
5 THE PROBLEM OF THE	10
6 PROBLEMS	11
7 SUMMARY	12
8 SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
9 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	14
10 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF STUDY AND PHILOSOPHY	15
11 SUMMARY	16
12 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	17
13 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	18
14 SUMMARY	19
15 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	20
16 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	21
17 SUMMARY	22
18 CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS	23
19 SUMMARY	24
20 SUMMARY	25
21 SUMMARY	26
22 SUMMARY	27
23 SUMMARY	28
24 SUMMARY	29
25 SUMMARY	30
26 SUMMARY	31
27 SUMMARY	32
28 SUMMARY	33
29 SUMMARY	34
30 SUMMARY	35
31 SUMMARY	36
32 SUMMARY	37
33 SUMMARY	38
34 SUMMARY	39
35 SUMMARY	40
36 SUMMARY	41
37 SUMMARY	42
38 SUMMARY	43
39 SUMMARY	44
40 SUMMARY	45
41 SUMMARY	46
42 SUMMARY	47
43 SUMMARY	48
44 SUMMARY	49
45 SUMMARY	50
46 SUMMARY	51
47 SUMMARY	52
48 SUMMARY	53
49 SUMMARY	54
50 SUMMARY	55
51 SUMMARY	56
52 SUMMARY	57
53 SUMMARY	58
54 SUMMARY	59
55 SUMMARY	60
56 SUMMARY	61
57 SUMMARY	62
58 SUMMARY	63
59 SUMMARY	64
60 SUMMARY	65
61 SUMMARY	66
62 SUMMARY	67
63 SUMMARY	68
64 SUMMARY	69
65 SUMMARY	70
66 SUMMARY	71
67 SUMMARY	72
68 SUMMARY	73
69 SUMMARY	74
70 SUMMARY	75
71 SUMMARY	76
72 SUMMARY	77
73 SUMMARY	78
74 SUMMARY	79
75 SUMMARY	80
76 SUMMARY	81
77 SUMMARY	82
78 SUMMARY	83
79 SUMMARY	84
80 SUMMARY	85
81 SUMMARY	86
82 SUMMARY	87
83 SUMMARY	88
84 SUMMARY	89
85 SUMMARY	90
86 SUMMARY	91
87 SUMMARY	92
88 SUMMARY	93
89 SUMMARY	94
90 SUMMARY	95
91 SUMMARY	96
92 SUMMARY	97
93 SUMMARY	98
94 SUMMARY	99
95 SUMMARY	100
96 SUMMARY	101
97 SUMMARY	102
98 SUMMARY	103
99 SUMMARY	104
100 SUMMARY	105
101 SUMMARY	106
102 SUMMARY	107
103 SUMMARY	108
104 SUMMARY	109
105 SUMMARY	110
106 SUMMARY	111
107 SUMMARY	112
108 SUMMARY	113
109 SUMMARY	114
110 SUMMARY	115
111 SUMMARY	116
112 SUMMARY	117
113 SUMMARY	118
114 SUMMARY	119
115 SUMMARY	120
116 SUMMARY	121
117 SUMMARY	122
118 SUMMARY	123
119 SUMMARY	124
120 SUMMARY	125
121 SUMMARY	126
122 SUMMARY	127
123 SUMMARY	128
124 SUMMARY	129
125 SUMMARY	130
126 SUMMARY	131
127 SUMMARY	132
128 SUMMARY	133
129 SUMMARY	134
130 SUMMARY	135
131 SUMMARY	136
132 SUMMARY	137
133 SUMMARY	138
134 SUMMARY	139
135 SUMMARY	140
136 SUMMARY	141
137 SUMMARY	142
138 SUMMARY	143
139 SUMMARY	144
140 SUMMARY	145
141 SUMMARY	146
142 SUMMARY	147
143 SUMMARY	148
144 SUMMARY	149
145 SUMMARY	150
146 SUMMARY	151
147 SUMMARY	152
148 SUMMARY	153
149 SUMMARY	154
150 SUMMARY	155
151 SUMMARY	156
152 SUMMARY	157
153 SUMMARY	158
154 SUMMARY	159
155 SUMMARY	160
156 SUMMARY	161
157 SUMMARY	162
158 SUMMARY	163
159 SUMMARY	164
160 SUMMARY	165
161 SUMMARY	166
162 SUMMARY	167
163 SUMMARY	168
164 SUMMARY	169
165 SUMMARY	170
166 SUMMARY	171
167 SUMMARY	172
168 SUMMARY	173
169 SUMMARY	174
170 SUMMARY	175
171 SUMMARY	176
172 SUMMARY	177
173 SUMMARY	178
174 SUMMARY	179
175 SUMMARY	180
176 SUMMARY	181
177 SUMMARY	182
178 SUMMARY	183
179 SUMMARY	184
180 SUMMARY	185
181 SUMMARY	186
182 SUMMARY	187
183 SUMMARY	188
184 SUMMARY	189
185 SUMMARY	190
186 SUMMARY	191
187 SUMMARY	192
188 SUMMARY	193
189 SUMMARY	194
190 SUMMARY	195
191 SUMMARY	196
192 SUMMARY	197
193 SUMMARY	198
194 SUMMARY	199
195 SUMMARY	200
196 SUMMARY	201
197 SUMMARY	202
198 SUMMARY	203
199 SUMMARY	204
200 SUMMARY	205
201 SUMMARY	206
202 SUMMARY	207
203 SUMMARY	208
204 SUMMARY	209
205 SUMMARY	210
206 SUMMARY	211
207 SUMMARY	212
208 SUMMARY	213
209 SUMMARY	214
210 SUMMARY	215
211 SUMMARY	216
212 SUMMARY	217
213 SUMMARY	218
214 SUMMARY	219
215 SUMMARY	220
216 SUMMARY	221
217 SUMMARY	222
218 SUMMARY	223
219 SUMMARY	224
220 SUMMARY	225
221 SUMMARY	226
222 SUMMARY	227
223 SUMMARY	228
224 SUMMARY	229
225 SUMMARY	230
226 SUMMARY	231
227 SUMMARY	232
228 SUMMARY	233
229 SUMMARY	234
230 SUMMARY	235
231 SUMMARY	236
232 SUMMARY	237
233 SUMMARY	238
234 SUMMARY	239
235 SUMMARY	240
236 SUMMARY	241
237 SUMMARY	242
238 SUMMARY	243
239 SUMMARY	244
240 SUMMARY	245
241 SUMMARY	246
242 SUMMARY	247
243 SUMMARY	248
244 SUMMARY	249
245 SUMMARY	250
246 SUMMARY	251
247 SUMMARY	252
248 SUMMARY	253
249 SUMMARY	254
250 SUMMARY	255
251 SUMMARY	256
252 SUMMARY	257
253 SUMMARY	258
254 SUMMARY	259
255 SUMMARY	260
256 SUMMARY	261
257 SUMMARY	262
258 SUMMARY	263
259 SUMMARY	264
260 SUMMARY	265
261 SUMMARY	266
262 SUMMARY	267
263 SUMMARY	268
264 SUMMARY	269
265 SUMMARY	270
266 SUMMARY	271
267 SUMMARY	272
268 SUMMARY	273
269 SUMMARY	274
270 SUMMARY	275
271 SUMMARY	276
272 SUMMARY	277
273 SUMMARY	278
274 SUMMARY	279
275 SUMMARY	280
276 SUMMARY	281
277 SUMMARY	282
278 SUMMARY	283
279 SUMMARY	284
280 SUMMARY	285
281 SUMMARY	286
282 SUMMARY	287
283 SUMMARY	288
284 SUMMARY	289
285 SUMMARY	290
286 SUMMARY	291
287 SUMMARY	292
288 SUMMARY	293
289 SUMMARY	294
290 SUMMARY	295
291 SUMMARY	296
292 SUMMARY	297
293 SUMMARY	298
294 SUMMARY	299
295 SUMMARY	300
296 SUMMARY	301
297 SUMMARY	302
298 SUMMARY	303
299 SUMMARY	304
300 SUMMARY	305
301 SUMMARY	306
302 SUMMARY	307
303 SUMMARY	308
304 SUMMARY	309
305 SUMMARY	310
306 SUMMARY	311
307 SUMMARY	312
308 SUMMARY	313
309 SUMMARY	314
310 SUMMARY	315
311 SUMMARY	316
312 SUMMARY	317
313 SUMMARY	318
314 SUMMARY	319
315 SUMMARY	320
316 SUMMARY	321
317 SUMMARY	322
318 SUMMARY	323
319 SUMMARY	324
320 SUMMARY	325
321 SUMMARY	326
322 SUMMARY	327
323 SUMMARY	328
324 SUMMARY	329
325 SUMMARY	330
326 SUMMARY	331
327 SUMMARY	332
328 SUMMARY	333
329 SUMMARY	334
330 SUMMARY	335
331 SUMMARY	336
332 SUMMARY	337
333 SUMMARY	338
334 SUMMARY	339
335 SUMMARY	340
336 SUMMARY	341
337 SUMMARY	342
338 SUMMARY	343
339 SUMMARY	344
340 SUMMARY	345
341 SUMMARY	346
342 SUMMARY	347
343 SUMMARY	348
344 SUMMARY	349
345 SUMMARY	350
346 SUMMARY	351
347 SUMMARY	352
348 SUMMARY	353
349 SUMMARY	354
350 SUMMARY	355
351 SUMMARY	356
352 SUMMARY	357
353 SUMMARY	358
354 SUMMARY	359
355 SUMMARY	360
356 SUMMARY	361
357 SUMMARY	362
358 SUMMARY	363
359 SUMMARY	364
360 SUMMARY	365
361 SUMMARY	366
362 SUMMARY	367
363 SUMMARY	368
364 SUMMARY	369
365 SUMMARY	370
366 SUMMARY	371
367 SUMMARY	372
368 SUMMARY	373
369 SUMMARY	374
370 SUMMARY	375
371 SUMMARY	376
372 SUMMARY	377
373 SUMMARY	378
374 SUMMARY	379
375 SUMMARY	380
376 SUMMARY	381
377 SUMMARY	382
378 SUMMARY	383
379 SUMMARY	384
380 SUMMARY	385
381 SUMMARY	386
382 SUMMARY	387
383 SUMMARY	388
384 SUMMARY	389
385 SUMMARY	390
386 SUMMARY	391
387 SUMMARY	392
388 SUMMARY	393
389 SUMMARY	394
390 SUMMARY	395
391 SUMMARY	396
392 SUMMARY	397
393 SUMMARY	398
394 SUMMARY	399
395 SUMMARY	400
396 SUMMARY	401
397 SUMMARY	402
398 SUMMARY	403
399 SUMMARY	404
400 SUMMARY	405
401 SUMMARY	406
402 SUMMARY	407
403 SUMMARY	408
404 SUMMARY	409
405 SUMMARY	410
406 SUMMARY	411
407 SUMMARY	412
408 SUMMARY	413
409 SUMMARY	414
410 SUMMARY	415
411 SUMMARY	416
412 SUMMARY	417
413 SUMMARY	418
414 SUMMARY	419
415 SUMMARY	420
416 SUMMARY	421
417 SUMMARY	422
418 SUMMARY	423
419 SUMMARY	424
420 SUMMARY	425
421 SUMMARY	426
422 SUMMARY	427
423 SUMMARY	428
424 SUMMARY	429
425 SUMMARY	430
426 SUMMARY	431
427 SUMMARY	432
428 SUMMARY	433
429 SUMMARY	434
430 SUMMARY	435
431 SUMMARY	436
432 SUMMARY	437
433 SUMMARY	438
434 SUMMARY	439
435 SUMMARY	440
436 SUMMARY	441
437 SUMMARY	442
438 SUMMARY	443
439 SUMMARY	444
440 SUMMARY	445
441 SUMMARY	446
442 SUMMARY	447
443 SUMMARY	448
444 SUMMARY	449
445 SUMMARY	450
446 SUMMARY	451
447 SUMMARY	452
448 SUMMARY	453
449 SUMMARY	454
450 SUMMARY	455
451 SUMMARY	456
452 SUMMARY	457
453 SUMMARY	458
454 SUMMARY	459
455 SUMMARY	460
456 SUMMARY	461
457 SUMMARY	462
458 SUMMARY	463
459 SUMMARY	464
460 SUMMARY	465
461 SUMMARY	466
462 SUMMARY	467
463 SUMMARY	468
464 SUMMARY	469
465 SUMMARY	470
466 SUMMARY	471
467 SUMMARY	472
468 SUMMARY	473
469 SUMMARY	474
470 SUMMARY	475
471 SUMMARY	476
472 SUMMARY	477
473 SUMMARY	478
474 SUMMARY	479
475 SUMMARY	480
476 SUMMARY	481
477 SUMMARY	482
478 SUMMARY	483
479 SUMMARY	484
480 SUMMARY	485
481 SUMMARY	486
482 SUMMARY	487
483 SUMMARY	488
484 SUMMARY	489
485 SUMMARY	490
486 SUMMARY	491
487 SUMMARY	492
488 SUMMARY	493
489 SUMMARY	494
490 SUMMARY	495
491 SUMMARY	496
492 SUMMARY	497
493 SUMMARY	498
494 SUMMARY	499
495 SUMMARY	500
496 SUMMARY	501
497 SUMMARY	502
498 SUMMARY	503
499 SUMMARY	504
500 SUMMARY	505
501 SUMMARY	506
502 SUMMARY	507
503 SUMMARY	508
504 SUMMARY	509
505 SUMMARY	510
506 SUMMARY	511
507 SUMMARY	512
508 SUMMARY	513
509 SUMMARY	514
510 SUMMARY	515
511 SUMMARY	516
512 SUMMARY	517
513 SUMMARY	518
514 SUMMARY	519
515 SUMMARY	520
516 SUMMARY	521
517 SUMMARY	522
518 SUMMARY	523
519 SUMMARY	524
520 SUMMARY	525
521 SUMMARY	526
522 SUMMARY	527
523 SUMMARY	528
524 SUMMARY	529
525 SUMMARY	530
526 SUMMARY	531
527 SUMMARY	532
528 SUMMARY	533
529 SUMMARY	534
530 SUMMARY	535
531 SUMMARY	536
532 SUMMARY	537
533 SUMMARY	538
534 SUMMARY	539
535 SUMMARY	540
536 SUMMARY	541
537 SUMMARY</	

# LIST OF TABLES

## CONTENTS

TABLE 1 1--GENERAL INFORMATION	iv
TABLE 2 2--REPRESENTATION	vi
TABLE 3 3--REPRESENTATION	vii
TABLE 4 4--REPRESENTATION	viii
TABLE 5 5--REPRESENTATION	ix
TABLE 6 6--REPRESENTATION	x
TABLE 7 7--REPRESENTATION	xi
TABLE 8 8--REPRESENTATION	xii
TABLE 9 9--REPRESENTATION	xiii
TABLE 10 10--REPRESENTATION	xiv
TABLE 11 11--REPRESENTATION	xv
TABLE 12 12--REPRESENTATION	xvi
TABLE 13 13--REPRESENTATION	xvii
TABLE 14 14--REPRESENTATION	xviii
TABLE 15 15--REPRESENTATION	xix
TABLE 16 16--REPRESENTATION	xx
TABLE 17 17--REPRESENTATION	xxi
TABLE 18 18--REPRESENTATION	xxii
TABLE 19 19--REPRESENTATION	xxiii
TABLE 20 20--REPRESENTATION	xxiv
TABLE 21 21--REPRESENTATION	xxv
TABLE 22 22--REPRESENTATION	xxvi
TABLE 23 23--REPRESENTATION	xxvii
TABLE 24 24--REPRESENTATION	xxviii
TABLE 25 25--REPRESENTATION	xxix
TABLE 26 26--REPRESENTATION	xxx
TABLE 27 27--REPRESENTATION	xxxi
TABLE 28 28--REPRESENTATION	xxxii
TABLE 29 29--REPRESENTATION	xxxiii
TABLE 30 30--REPRESENTATION	xxxiv
TABLE 31 31--REPRESENTATION	xxxv
TABLE 32 32--REPRESENTATION	xxxvi
TABLE 33 33--REPRESENTATION	xxxvii
TABLE 34 34--REPRESENTATION	xxxviii
TABLE 35 35--REPRESENTATION	xxxix
TABLE 36 36--REPRESENTATION	xl
TABLE 37 37--REPRESENTATION	xli
TABLE 38 38--REPRESENTATION	xlii
TABLE 39 39--REPRESENTATION	xliii
TABLE 40 40--REPRESENTATION	xliv
TABLE 41 41--REPRESENTATION	xlv
TABLE 42 42--REPRESENTATION	xlvi
TABLE 43 43--REPRESENTATION	xlvii
TABLE 44 44--REPRESENTATION	xlviii
TABLE 45 45--REPRESENTATION	xlvix
TABLE 46 46--REPRESENTATION	l
TABLE 47 47--REPRESENTATION	li
TABLE 48 48--REPRESENTATION	lii
TABLE 49 49--REPRESENTATION	liii
TABLE 50 50--REPRESENTATION	liv
TABLE 51 51--REPRESENTATION	lv
TABLE 52 52--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 53 53--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 54 54--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 55 55--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 56 56--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 57 57--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 58 58--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 59 59--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 60 60--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 61 61--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 62 62--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 63 63--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 64 64--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 65 65--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 66 66--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 67 67--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 68 68--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 69 69--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 70 70--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 71 71--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 72 72--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 73 73--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 74 74--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 75 75--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 76 76--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 77 77--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 78 78--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 79 79--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 80 80--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 81 81--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 82 82--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 83 83--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 84 84--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 85 85--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 86 86--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 87 87--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 88 88--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 89 89--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 90 90--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 91 91--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 92 92--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 93 93--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 94 94--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 95 95--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 96 96--REPRESENTATION	lvi
TABLE 97 97--REPRESENTATION	lvii
TABLE 98 98--REPRESENTATION	lviii
TABLE 99 99--REPRESENTATION	lvix
TABLE 100 100--REPRESENTATION	lvi

# TABLES AND TABLE ABSTRACTS

## Page

TABLE 5.1--INITIATION OF STRUCTURE-----	51
TABLE 5.2--INITIATION OF STRUCTURE-----	51
TABLE 5.3--INITIATION OF STRUCTURE-----	51
TABLE 5.4--INITIATION OF STRUCTURE-----	52
TABLE 5.5--INITIATION OF STRUCTURE-----	52
TABLE 6.1--TOLERANCE OF FREQUENCY-----	53
TABLE 6.2--TOLERANCE OF FREQUENCY-----	54
TABLE 6.3--TOLERANCE OF FREQUENCY-----	54
TABLE 6.4--TOLERANCE OF FREQUENCY-----	55
TABLE 6.5--TOLERANCE OF FREQUENCY-----	55
TABLE 7.1--ROLE IDENTIFICATION-----	56
TABLE 7.2--ROLE IDENTIFICATION-----	56
TABLE 7.3--ROLE IDENTIFICATION-----	56
TABLE 7.4--ROLE IDENTIFICATION-----	57
TABLE 7.5--ROLE IDENTIFICATION-----	57
TABLE 8.1--CONSIDERATION-----	58
TABLE 8.2--CONSIDERATION-----	58
TABLE 8.3--CONSIDERATION-----	58
TABLE 8.4--CONSIDERATION-----	58
TABLE 8.5--CONSIDERATION-----	58
TABLE 9.1--PRODUCTION EMPHASIS-----	60
TABLE 9.2--PRODUCTION EMPHASIS-----	60
TABLE 9.3--PRODUCTION EMPHASIS-----	61
TABLE 9.4--PRODUCTION EMPHASIS-----	61
TABLE 9.5--PRODUCTION EMPHASIS-----	61

11. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 273: 1033-1034 (1995).

# LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	Page
TABLE 14.4--PERMANENTNESS-----	80
TABLE 14.5--DISTRIBUTION OF STRUCTURES-----	81
TABLE 14.6--POLYMERIZATION OF POLYMER-----	81
TABLE 14.7--SOL-GEL MECHANISM-----	81
TABLE 14.8--CONCENTRATION-----	81
TABLE 14.9--FRACTIONAL DEGREE-----	81
TABLE 14.10--PERCENTAGE OF POLYMER-----	81
TABLE 14.11--ESTIMATION-----	81

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the  
Graduate Council of the University of Florida  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

AN ANALYSIS OF LEADER BEHAVIOR OF  
SELECTED COMMUNITY EDUCATION COORDINATORS  
IN FLORIDA

by

Albert Leonard Saffarak

October 1972

Chairman: Dr. Phillip S. Clark  
Major Department: Educational Administration

This study was conducted to determine the ideal nature of leader behavior of community education coordinators based on the opinion of national sources of education authorities as well as to assess the actual nature of leader behavior of selected community education coordinators in Florida according to Stogdill's dimensions of leader behaviors. Specifically, the following questions were addressed:

I. Is there a relationship between the actual behavior exhibited by selected community education coordinators and the ideal leader behavior suggested by the national authorities?

II. Is there a relationship between the personal variables of sex, age, years of experience as a community education coordinator, previous professional experience, and the 12 leader behavior categories?



**Abstract**

[illegible]

**Abstract**

1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 26

**Abstract**

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

1000

100

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = \|u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \quad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{H}^1.$$

100

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997; 277: 1039-1043.

In an experiment with the London School of Economics Psychiatrists, the structure of the Central Nervous System in 45 patients and controls were compared to determine the total brain influence of 15 selected coordinates as assessed by five measures of each coordinate's effect on memory and very small when the 1980-111. In addition, the results of the 1980-111 were analyzed on the basis of five personal variations.

The following conclusions are based on the results of this study. Deviations from the completion of ideal and actual teacher behavior supports the assumption that there are significant differences between the ideal leadership behavior suggested by national authorities and the actual teacher behavior exhibited in

summary statistic measures as 10 of the 12 constructs of the LEL-31. Only two of the constructs, Beliefs of Democracy and Beliefs of Freedom, were not significantly different.

Concerning the five personal variables, the following conclusions were reached:

1- The variable of sex produced no significant differences in the perceived leader behavior of the coordinators in any of the 12 behavior constructs.

2- The variable of age produced no significant differences in the perceived leader behavior of the coordinators in any of the 12 behavior constructs.

3- The variable of years experience as a coordinator produced the significant differences in the perceived behavior of the coordinators in the constructs of Persuasiveness, Initiation of Structure, and Superior Orientation. There was no significant differences in the other nine constructs.

4- The variable of training in supervisory management produced no significant differences in the perceived leader behavior of the coordinators in any of the 12 constructs.

5- The variable of previous professional experience produced no significant differences in the perceived leader behavior of the coordinators in any of the 12 behavior constructs.

## CHAPTER I Introduction

Many writers have not noted the changing role of education in society. Kewgatch (New 1958) points out that various changes in situations and events have conspired to make the school system more complex today than it was 50 years ago. Directors are being confronted with many innovations and constantly changing values. Consequently, the educational system is also becoming more vulnerable to outside forces that impinge upon it. Two of these 3 outside are the role of the community school movement and the role of community control of the schools movement (p. xiii).

An explanation in community education is based upon an assumption that the more adults to be served by the educational establishment have a basic right to active participation in all aspects of the process. However, according to New (1958), "School-community relations are adversely affected by an organic cultural phenomenon, heretofore, and by psychological factors of inadequacies, attitudes, beliefs, and interests" (p. 12). When the original school situation has been recognized as an attempt to address these situations, the individual charged with carrying out the community education function should be expected to deal with the challenge. Community education must provide the

appropriate leadership (in community-based context) to support leadership in the community-based health promotion process.

The major purpose of this study was to examine leadership performance of community education coordinators in the development of community involvement in health promotion education process. Specifically, the focus of the investigation is on the behavior of individuals as they perform the functions of leadership.

### Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to determine the "actual" nature of leader behavior based on the opinion of national community education authorities as well as to assess the actual nature of leader behavior of selected community education coordinators in Florida according to Stogdill's taxonomy list of leader behavior (Stogdill, 1974).

Specifically, the following questions were addressed:

1. Is there a relationship between the 'actual' frequency of leader behaviors exhibited by selected community education coordinators and the 'ideal' frequency of leader behavior suggested by the national authorities?
2. Is there a relationship between the following six variables:
  - a. sex
  - b. age
  - c. prior experience as a community education coordinator
  - d. training in community education

are identified with field descriptions.

are community coordinators.

are the 11 leadership behavior dimensions based on the identified of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

The preceding questions were answered according to the ratings received by the selected community education coordinators on the 11 leadership behavior constructs.

#### Construct 1: Representing

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators speak and act as the representative of the group based on the personal data variables: sex, age, years experience, etc.?

#### Construct 2: Demand Recognition

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which coaches to education coordinators recognize conflicting demands and reflect disorder in the union based on the personal data variables, sex, age, years experience, etc.?

#### Construct 3: Tolerance for Uncertainty

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators are able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety and upset based on the personal data variables: sex, age, years experience, etc.?

#### Construct 4: Persuasion

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators use persuasion and

argument effectiveness and conflict among participants based on personal characteristics (e.g., gender, age, years experience, etc.)

#### Component 6: Facilitation of Leaders

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators clearly define their own roles and allow followers to know what is expected of them, based on the personal data variables (e.g., sex, age, years experience, etc.)?

#### Component 7: Toleration of Freedom

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators allow followers scope for initiative, decision and action, based on the personal data variables (e.g., sex, age, years experience, etc.)?

#### Component 8: Self-Reliance

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators actively encourage the leadership role rather than surrender leadership to others based on the personal data variables (e.g., sex, age, years experience, etc.)?

#### Component 9: Generalization

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators regard the comfort, well-being status and contribution of followers based upon the personal data variables (e.g., sex, age, years experience, etc.)?

### Contrast 3: Pedagogical Emphasis

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators apply resources for and deliver support based on the personal data variables, i.e., sex, age, years experience, etc.?

### Contrast 4: Predictive Accuracy

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators exhibit foresight and ability in predicting outcomes accurately based on the personal data variables, i.e., sex, age, years experience, etc.?

### Contrast 5: Interaction

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators exhibit a client-based organization and resolve intercoordinator conflict based on the personal data variables, i.e., sex, age, years experience, etc.?

### Contrast 6: Superior Relationships

Is there a difference in the perceived degree to which community education coordinators maintain cordial relations with superiors, have influence over them, and are striving for higher status based upon the personal data variables, i.e., sex, age, years experience, etc.?

### Limitations And Limitations

The following restrictions were observed in conducting the study

8. The study of leadership behavior was based on data from 75 people located in various school districts in the state of Florida.

9. The persons chosen to participate were selected by community education coordinators and may not have been representative of the community at large.

10. The leader behaviors measured were restricted to those dimensions measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--III.

The following limitations were recognized in this investigation:

1. The remaining data are the perceptions of community members and not necessarily the actual behavior exhibited by the coordinator.

2. Responses may have been influenced by the respondent's desire to provide a positive image of leader behavior for the individual coordinator.

3. Data were gathered from the state of Florida only; therefore, the generalizability drawn from the data are limited.

#### Justification For The Study

"The general functions of organization and administration for community education is similar to that of any other non-profit institutional endeavor; the character of the function is, however, influenced by the values that determine the philosophy" (Baker, 1973, p. 148). In addition, Baker stated that such basic assumptions should be made concerning the characteristics



and goals of an effective community school administration. Specifically, these assumptions should include:

- Beliefs or dogmatically established goals and a viable philosophy should be established, in the main, for the school/principal/schools.
- The administrative staff should be an "open" one, not fearing change or challenge.
- The administrative climate should reflect the philosophy of community education, using a problem solving approach.
- A firm and flexible administrative organization, in contrast to a vertical one, reflects the best practice.
- The individual school and community must be seen as an educational unit, with freedom to adapt to the needs of the local area and delegated authority commensurate with assigned responsibility.
- Administration should recognize that not all wisdom is found in the administrative staff but is liberally provided by teachers and the teaching staff.
- Ultimately, decisions should be made by those possessing the competence to do so, not merely the rank or position.
- Leadership should bring people, ideas, and resources together to provide an optimum opportunity for all learners to learn.

One of the problems faced by administrators in establishing

top community education is that of resistance to change on the part of the public. Preparation programs of which most administrators are products, urge that the people be told about the schools. Parents may be brought into the school, and the school's programs sold to the people. Very few efforts have been

media which allow parents, students, and community members opportunities to express their feelings about the schools with school leaders. "Information flow has been primarily one way. Significant feedback from and with parents has been provided for parents on the average" (Lundington, 1979, p. 134).

Community education has an unusual burden for a strong program of communication and public relations. Establishing the correct necessary for such communication requires the community educator to possess specialized human, technical, and conceptual skills (Wenger, 1975). These skills stem from the foundations upon which leader behavior is developed. Clark and Ryback (1975) considered the community education leader must fulfill to human, technical and conceptual skills when his leader behavior is other-oriented:

This approach views leadership in others, rather than in student leaders. Leaders using this approach make it possible for others to accept, assume responsibility and participate in decision making. They help people become as involved as they developed and developed as they wish to be involved, and encourage them to apply their skills and creativity in actively determined goals (p. 15).

Such an approach to the organization and administration of community education requires an open flexible type of administration able to deal with diverse community inputs.

There have been many attempts at so-called school participation in education over the years. However, as an attempt to increase public involvement, the state of Florida, in 1971, enacted that each school system must have a school advisory

school. Furthermore, within this context is the additional requirement that such schools are to be "broadly representative of the community served by the school" (Chapter 15-218, Laws of Florida). The school-community advisory council should provide the linkage between the community, its problems, and potential solutions.

However, Baskin and Brink (1971), speaking of the community advisory council movement in general, stated that "participation can very easily be phony; real lasting participation must reside in effective collaboration between the community (including the students) and the school in all decisions making" (p. 178).

According to Moore (1971), "the essence of the community education philosophy is that the program must serve and be responsive to the entire community . . . The informal adviser (teacher who depends upon student authority and a 'right ship' orientation will be very uncomfortable with this approach" (pp 115-178). Thus, the leadership provided by the community education coordinator plays a vital role in the development of the community education process. Considering the frequency of interpersonal interactions with a variety of publics, specific patterns of facilitative leadership behaviors should be involved in the role of community education.

In general, this study should assist in the clarification and understanding of the leader behavior of community education coordinators as well as what variables might influence these behaviors.

### Definition of Terms

Community education. An operational philosophy of education, when actualized serves the entire community by providing for all the educational needs of the community members. It provides the educational establishment a systematic methodology for bringing total community resources to bear on community problems in an effort to enhance community development.

Community education coordinator. The individual charged with the responsibility of developing and administering community education within the school system.

Leader. An individual who, based on his office or official status in a group or organization, is placed in the position of being able to influence the activities of that group or organization as he attempts to achieve his goals. In this study, the leader is identified as the community education coordinator.

Leader behavior. Those behaviors exhibited by an individual while he engages in influencing group or organizational activities.

School-community advisory council. A representative group of school-community members who hold common the common goal of community development through the identification of problems and the application of solutions (Ohio Community Schools, 1971, p. 12). An advisory council works to address community needs as determined by joint effort of the council and the community education coordinator.

### Procedures

The procedures section is divided into three parts. The first part outlined the design of the study and selection of the sample. The second section is an explanation of the development of the instruments and the data collection process. The third section deals with the treatment of the collected data.

#### Sample and Sample

Community School of Administrators. The community education coordinators were identified with assistance from the Florida Department of Education, Adult and Community Education Section. The Department of Education provided a list of 181 community education coordinators for the school year 1975-76. The list of coordinators was divided by male and female and each list was numbered. Using a random numbers table, 10 males and 10 female coordinators were chosen. The chosen coordinators were contacted by mail and asked to participate in the study. Two additional groups of five males and five females were randomly selected to provide alternate samples to complete the 20 coordinators. Those individuals who chose not to participate did so because they either did not have a school-community advisory council, did not relate to an existing school-community advisory council, or no longer functioned in the role of community education coordinator.

School Community Advisory Council members. The overlapping data was requested to identify the chairpersons of school community councils as well as four members to participate in the

study. The selection of only five advisory council members for each coordinator in the study could bias the results since the selections are done by the coordinator being rated. However, the same bias effect would apply equally to all respondents.

#### Selection of university centers for community education.

A search of 46 College Directories was completed to determine the "ideal" leader behavior. This identifies the total population of individuals responsible for directing various community education leadership training programs in the United States during fiscal year 1997. The names and addresses of these individuals were provided by the University of Florida Center for Community Education.

#### Instrumentation and Data Collection

##### Questionnaire

The instrument used in this study was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-180 (LBDQ-180) developed by Ralph Stogdill (1963). The questionnaire was designed to obtain descriptions of leaders, through 18 dimensions of leader behavior. The leader behavior is quantified objectively in terms of the frequency of occurrence within the 18 dimensions. A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix A. In addition to the basic instrument, a personal data sheet was developed. This questionnaire was for personal data such as age and sex, as well as specific information concerning years experience as a community education coordinator, training in community education, previous professional experience and professional appointments. A copy of the personal data questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

The third instrument, the Leader Behavior Profile was developed by the researcher for the purpose of identifying the relative importance of priorities for the 12 dimensions of leader behavior measured on the LEBS--EII. The profile is an arrangement of the LEBS--EII and consists of the 12 categories which the LEBS--EII measures. This instrument was used to assess the opinion of community executive leader directors concerning the priorities for specific leader behaviors. A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix E.

#### Data Treatment

LEBS--EII consists of 100 items describing leader behavior. Each item is answered using a structured answer format with one of five possible responses: always, often, occasionally, seldom, never. Each item receives a score from five to one. Each sub-scale score consists of the sum of the scores from the items of the sub-scale.

Research (1981) concluded that subscales of the LEBS--EII were a theoretically related or different dimensions of leader personality, leader satisfaction, and group performance. His theoretical work was based on the factors of identifiable leadership patterns.

The following 12 dimensions of leader behavior were defined in the LEBS--EII:

1. Representation. The perceived degree to which an individual speaks and acts as the representative of the group.
2. Group Identification. The perceived degree to which an individual recognizes conflicting demands and requests directed to the group.

3. **Tolerance for Uncertainty.** The perceived degree to which an individual is able to tolerate uncertainty and postpone judgment without anxiety and stress.

4. **Persuasiveness.** The perceived degree to which an individual uses persuasion and argument effectively and exhibits strong convictions.

5. **Initiation of Structure.** The perceived degree to which an individual clearly defines his own role and defines followers in terms of what is expected of them.

6. **Resource of Power.** The perceived degree to which an individual allows followers scope for initiative, freedom, and action.

7. **Self-Reliance.** The perceived degree to which an individual actively assumes the leadership role rather than surrender leadership to others.

8. **Consideration.** The perceived degree to which an individual regards the comfort, well-being, status, and satisfaction of followers.

9. **Production Emphasis.** The perceived degree to which an individual expects pressure for production output.

10. **Predictive Accuracy.** The perceived degree to which an individual exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.

11. **Integration.** The perceived degree to which an individual maintains a closely knit organization and resolves intermember conflicts.



12. Superior Expectations The perceived degree to which an individual expects a cordial relationship with superiors. Has influence over them, and is striving for higher status.

The Leader Behavior Profile consists of 108 12 behavior constructs assessed by the 180Q-RII. The respondent was requested to rank in order of importance the 12 subcategories of leader behavior. A forced-choice method was used for ranking the 12 categories. Values were assigned based on the following scales: Most important, Very important, Moderate importance, High importance, Little or no importance. Each category received a score from 1 to 5. This partial scale created a comparison between the 180Q-RII subcategory and the Leader Behavior Profile subcategory.

### Validity

In Campbell's (1928) System of Research on the 180Q-RII, he explained the test of validity given

in order to test the validity of the subcategory of the 180Q-RII, Campbell (1928) with the assistance of a playwright, wrote a scenario for each of the subcategories. The items in a subcategory were used as a basis for writing the scenario for that category of behavior. Experienced actors played the role of supervisor and workers. Each role was played by two different actors. Action occurred with each of the role performance. Observers used 180Q-RII to describe the behavior of the supervisor. An implicit and difference was found between two different actors playing the same role. However, the actors playing a given role were identified independently higher in that role than in other roles. Since each role was designed to mirror the behaviors represented by the items 180Q-RII subcategory definition, and a new role is always used by the observers to mirror the playing of the role, it can be

concluded that the scales measure what  
they are supposed to measure (p. 21)

### Reliability.

A modified Kuder-Richardson formula was used to compute the reliability of the LEBR--BII. Each item was correlated with the remainder of the items in the subscale. The resulting reliability coefficients ranged from .54 to .87 for nine different groups of leaders, estimates of sufficient reliability for use in this study (Sagevall, 1982).

### Administration

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form BII can be used by a leader to describe his own behavior, or by someone else of the leader so described as a given leader.

The LEBR--BII (Appendix 4) was administered to first school census by advisory council members. The community education coordinator completed the personnel data sheet (Appendix 4).

The Leader Behavior Profile was completed by Center Directors from the Centers for Community Education.

### Method of Sampling Data

Initial contact with the 18 community education coordinators was made by mail. Each coordinator was asked to provide data on the staff and to provide information concerning the school-community advisory council. Following this initial contact, the researcher contacted each coordinator by phone to discuss the study and obtain a date for gathering the data.

Copies of the LEBR--BII and the personnel data sheet were mailed to the coordinator. Instructions were given for the

equilibrium of it be distributed by the chairperson of the delivery council. Upon completion of the questionnaire, the chairpersons were to return the questionnaires and the researchers' personal data sheet directly to the researcher. Instructions for completing the survey were placed on the first page of the instrument (Appendix B). The instrument required approximately 15 minutes to complete. A series of follow-up contacts were made with those individuals who were slow in returning the questionnaires.

The Leader Behavior Profile was mailed with a cover letter to each of the Directors of University Canada for Community Education. Instructions for completing the survey were placed on the first page of the instrument. The instrument required approximately 15 minutes to complete. A follow-up contact was made with the Directors who were negligent in returning the survey.

#### Method of Statistical Analysis

Data for analysis were drawn from the administration of the Leader Behavior Questionnaire Form III and the Leader Behavior Profile. The data were run from the SPSS-III were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance to answer each of the 12 questions concerning the differences in leader behavior based on the personal data variables. The .05 level of significance was used for each of the constructs. A follow-up test was performed on those variables found to be significant using Tukey's HSD procedure. The alpha for each question was

based upon the ratings of the participants' stated answers made by the advisory council members.

The data received from the Leader Behavior Profile were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance with a single linear regression procedure. Effect coding was used on the raw data to compensate for the unequal number in each group. Two scores from the 1955-56 and the Leader Behavior Profile were changed to 1-scores to conform to the assumptions of homogeneity of variance and to standardize the mean scores for the two sets of data. A single linear regression procedure was used in computing the F-test and then provided for orthogonal comparisons between the "ideal" behavior as determined by the Cancer Directors and the "actual" behavior as reported by the advisory council members. The .01 level of significance was used.

The services of the University of Florida Computer Center were employed to analyze the data. Computer analysis was run using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

### Summary

The sample population for this study was composed of 20 secondary school coordinators from Florida who were randomly selected. Each of the coordinators identified five school-community advisory council members to participate in the study. In addition, all the directors of university centers for Community Education were surveyed.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form 810, developed by Ralph Stogdill was the instrument used to assess assembly unit's members' perceptions of the coordinators' leader behavior. A personal data sheet was developed to obtain from the selected coordinators the information used for analysis.

The Leader Behavior Profile, an abridgement of the BRBQ-810, was used to collect data from the Center Directors concerning "ideal" leader behavior. These data were used to compare the "ideal" behaviors with the "actual" behaviors of the coordinators.

The data for each of the 32 constructs for the BRBQ-810 were grouped by personal data variables and analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance and Tukey-B10 procedures using the .05 level of significance. Data for comparison of the Center Directors' "ideal" with the coordinators' "actual" were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance with a simple linear regression procedure. The .05 level of significance was used for this analysis.

Chapter II contains a review of related literature and related studies pertaining to the leadership in computer education.

## CHAPTER 11

### SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature and research relevant to the study of community education administrators. The focus of this study is on the leadership behavior of community education administrators. This chapter contains two sections entitled "Leadership Theory and Community Education History and Philosophy."

#### Leadership Theory

Leadership theories are reviewed in light of the leadership issues of this study. There are basically six categories of leadership theories. In this specific research effort, the "contingency-transactional" theories were chosen for the basis of the study. Literature pertaining to the other five types of leadership theories will only be briefly discussed.

#### Environmental Theory

Burphy (1941) maintained that leadership qualities were not part of the individual, but a function of the situation. The leader assumes the situation and is the environmental factor through which the solution is achieved.

The selected writer, quoted as Schneider (1951) is the controlling factor in leadership. He found that group

military leaders is implied, emerges in proportion to the number of conflicts.

#### Stogdill's Theory (a)

Leon STODGILL concluded that individuals possess a varying degree of intelligence, energy, and social force. Therefore, a superior few will inevitably emerge as leaders.

Turner (1988) stressed similar conclusions from his study in social psychology. He maintained that leadership can be explained in terms of traits of personality and character. Therefore, trait theories could be used to explain leadership.

#### Personality-Situational Theories

By combining the two previously mentioned theories, another method for describing and studying leadership was established.

Kurt LEWIN suggested that leadership is produced by three factors: (1) the personality traits of the leader, (2) the nature of the group and of its members, and (3) the events confronting the group.

John BASS maintained that when group formation and interaction take place, leadership is a natural interaction phenomenon.

Bass (1980) established five considerations when developing leadership theory: (1) dependent bureaucracy and adaptability of managers, (2) informal organization and interpersonal relations, (3) hierarchical authority which gets required because it determines the relationship between superior and subord status, (4) job enlargement and employee-centered supervision that permits individual self actualization, and (5)

process-oriented management and joint consideration that achieve integration of individual and organizational goals.

Galbraith (1981) suggested that leadership represents a dynamic interaction between the goals of the leader and the goals of the followers. It functions to help the group decide upon a goal and to help the group find the means to the goal.

### Stogdill's Theory

The development of effective and cohesive organizations was a major concern of Stogdill and McPhee.

Stogdill (1964) identified a basic conflict between the organization and the individual. He stated that it is the individual's character to be self-direction and to seek fulfillment most through exercising initiative and responsibility. On the other hand, it is the tendency of organizations to structure member roles and to control performance in the interest of achieving specified objectives.

Stogdill (1964) perceived leadership as the link of two organizational types—Theory X and Theory Y. A Theory X leader attempts to direct and motivate people from the assumption that people are passive and resistant to organizational needs. Theory Y perceives that people already possess motivation and desire for responsibility and therefore, the leader attempts to create work conditions in order to make possible fulfillment of their needs while directing their efforts to achieve the organization's goals objectives.

Likier (1940) observed that leadership is based on interaction. The leader builds group cohesiveness and motivation



by providing freedom for responsible decision making and exercise of initiative.

### Exchange Theories

French (1958) conceptualized leadership in terms of a social exchange theory. It is based on the assumption that the group provides status and social satisfaction to the leader in exchange for his contributions to goal attainment. Leadership involves an equitable exchange relationship between leader and followers. Acknowledgment of role obligations allows each party to identify the contributions of others as an applicable basis.

### Interaction-Contingency Studies

Basson (1980) based his theory of leadership on three variables: context, interaction, and variables. Leadership is defined in terms of organization of interactions. The greater the frequency of interaction and positive relations between members, the greater the overall liking and clarity of group norms. The higher the rank of a person within the group, the wider the interaction, the more likely his activities conform to group norms, and the greater the number of group members for whom he will initiate interactions.

The Ohio State Leadership Studies (Stogdill, 1974) were organized as an attempt to develop a more defocused theory of leadership. According to Stogdill (1974), much of the research which had taken place earlier focused upon an attempt to identify the traits of leaders. Bass (1980), Jackson (1983),

and Steptin (1948) indicated that the group (system) was more than satisfactory in maintaining leadership.

Since the first approach had proved unsatisfactory, a new approach was suggested. "Attempts were made to study the behavior rather than the traits of leadership; in other words, to describe the individual's behavior while he acted as a leader of a group or organization" (Stephens, 1974, p. 218).

Defining leadership as to a degree of influence, Bales (1958) provided a concise explanation of the behavior and approach in the study of leaders:

First of all, it focuses upon observed behavior rather than upon a quality usually inferred from this behavior. No presuppositions are made about a systematic relationship between leader behavior and an underlying capacity or personality presumably determined of that behavior. By the same token, no general assumptions are made that the leader behavior which the leader exhibits in one group situation will be manifested in other group situations. . . . And then the term *behavior* implies that this behavior is determined either consciously or unconsciously. Either determinism is desirable, as a study condition of the man, but the concept of leader behavior does not itself preclude us to accept one or opposition to the other. (p. 12)

Although differences in terminology emerged, theorists and researchers alike reached rather remarkable agreement as to what the major dimensions or variables associated with leader behavior. Richard (1918) delineated the difference between organizational efficiency and organizational effectiveness. Likewise, Gurnwright and Bower (1981) identified leader behaviors related toward maintenance of efficiency and effectiveness which

they emphasized on goal attainment activities and work-related achievement activities. These behaviors strongly paralleled what faced in the writings of Bernard.

Similarly, Bate and Bain (Copyright and Under, 1971) delineated two major behavioral styles among supervisors. They noted that some supervisors were production-oriented and tended to stress efficiency, production, and goal achievement, while others were employee-oriented and stressed motivated morale, and employee satisfaction.

Initially, two major dimensions of leader behavior were identified by researchers at Ohio State University. Stogdill (1950) and his associates at Ohio State developed a list of approximately 180 items describing different aspects of leader behavior. Through a process of sorting into sub-tables, 150 items were found to be conceptually unique. These were used in developing the list form of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (1976).

Bales and Shier (1937) delineated two basic dimensions to leader behavior: initiating structure and consideration--following the work of Stogdill (1950). There is nothing unique about these two dimensions of leader behavior. The ideas embodied in the concepts of initiating structure and consideration may have been used by effective leaders for a long time in guiding their behavior with group members. While the concepts themselves, with different labels perhaps, have been invoked frequently by philosophers and social scientists to explain the leadership phenomenon (Gutkin, 1966, p. 81).

Many other individuals have hypothesized similar dimensions. In an attempt to summarize evidence to substantiate these dimensions, Bass (1948) cited more than 38 studies which had been conducted in organizational environments (pp. 181-185).

Balpin and Graft (Stogdill, 1948) were not satisfied that leader behavior could be adequately described with two factors. They developed a four factor scale. *Abstractly, Production, Diplomatic, Strong, and Consideration* (p. 140).

Agreeing with Balpin and Graft (1948) that two factors were not sufficient to describe the complexities of leader behavior, Stogdill (1950) developed a new theoretical framework known as the autonomy-reinforcement theory of role attainment. According to Stogdill, as group members interact, their roles are defined by mutually reinforced expectations relative to the particular individual's intentions. As such individual interacts, he is defined by the contributions he makes to the group. The initiation and maintenance of structure defines the level of interaction and expectations. In the preestablished leadership positions, the leader is expected to play a role that differs from the roles of other group members.

This autonomy reinforcement model is applicable to the study of administratively educating coordinators. Stogdill's research has yielded several leadership ratings. One form, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form III, will be used in this study. The leader behavior approach has been used previously in a variety of manners for the study of school administrators and community education coordinators.

the majority sample (80%) believed so. Thus, further research needs to determine the relationship between the superintendents' and perceptions of how he or she believed as the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as concerned with the school board and staff perceptions. Sturge (1994) revealed the leadership of principals-perceived by teachers, staff members, and self. The three groups held similar beliefs of leader behavior.

Reese (1988) focused on the leader behavior of 118 principals in Alberta, Canada. Using the LEBDQ-III, the findings indicated that (1) teachers' estimates of the school's performance were not correlated to the perception of leadership in the school, (2) teacher satisfaction was sensitive to the perception of the school leadership and (3) confidence in principal was related to school leadership.

Leach (1985) compared "high" and "low" innovating principals using the LEBDQ-III. He found that the high innovating principals received higher ratings in six dimensions of leader behavior: Initiating Structure, Predictable Autonomy, Representation, Information, Persuasion, and Consideration.

In a study of the perceptions of principals and secondary school coordinators with respect to the variables authority, responsibility, and delegation, Mitchell (1983) found no significant difference between the principals' perception and the coordinator's perception of the coordinator's behavior in Initiating Structure or Consideration. Likewise, Krupp (1985), in a recent study of secondary education coordinators, determined that, within an advisory council setting, coordinators and council

leaders with (a) no job experience, (b) no particular evidence of best leadership characteristics, consideration plus those they possess; (c) Miner (1944) did an even greater preference for leader behavior involving no consideration than that of including strategies.

Miller (1971), using the LBSQ, found that in comparing effectiveness and personal factors of secondary education administrators, the effectiveness was independent of age, experience as a coordinator, and grade level of teaching experience. Teachers with seven or more years of public school experience were more effective in including strategies than those with less than seven years experience. However, he found no difference in consideration. Secondary education coordinators with master's degrees were more effective in including strategies and compliance than those with bachelor's degrees.

According to Wentley (1971), studies based on a behavioral approach support some basic generalizations about leadership:

1. Educational leaders are perceived to possess unique leader behavior orientations.
2. Preferences and expectations for leader behavior vary widely among reference groups.
3. The leader's perceptions of his own behavior differ from others' perceptions. (p. 148-149)

Wells (1965) contends that what the leader does and how he does it is perceived by others who work with the leader is the nucleus of leader behavior. Evaluation of leader behavior can be made in terms of the individual, the group, or both.

According to Baum (1981), the study of leadership should be an observed behavior. Thus, research should give attention to what happened or appears to be happening rather than on finding the cause of observed behavior.

### Community Education: History and Philosophy

Although Clark and Stone (1917) trace the historical roots of community education to the thirteenth century, history is not clear as to when the concept was really first applied. Torres and Posing (1985) speculated that some community school principles were used when people first began to live together in any form of community and began to transmit the progress of learning from elders to youth (p. 15). Koverly (1985) traced the use of public school facilities for community education to the Colonial Period in American history. Schools were used for adult evening classes as early as 1818 in Providence, Rhode Island, and approximately 18 years later in Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Chicago (Benn, 1938, p. 18).

Barnard (1918), writing in the middle and later nineteenth century, advocated the school as a vehicle for improving social, moral and economic conditions through citizen involvement.

Benig J. Snow (1944) advocated community use of public school facilities as (p.15)

In using the school plant for any activities . . . the people of the community feel that they are using for their own needs public facilities which have been paid for by their taxes. They seek to use such, tangible results in the way of more prosperous and efficient facilities and better schools

should not, coming from the increased effort in the district school. Because the schools are public institutions in fact as well as name, people know whether the schools are really making their money and they are willing to work to see that do. (p. 104)

Tanner and Kestley (1965) gleaned from the writings of Dewey a list of concepts from which the philosophy of democratic education was contained. They are as follows:

1. There must be a two way interaction between the community and the school.
2. The school itself must be organized as a community. The school has a career life of its own and is itself a genuine social institution, a community.
3. Learning must be planned in consideration of the total environment of the individual.
4. The school should be organized around the social activities in which children will engage after leaving school.
5. Society has a definite effect upon discipline in the school.
6. Social environment supplies the intelligible activities and descriptions to improve the society.
7. Education should be continuously used by society as an instrument for its own improvement.
8. The future adult society should be in agreement over that in which its members live as children.
9. Education may be continuously used by children to form social unity through sharing the good as well as that will not produce unity (11).



18. Activities and learning go hand in hand. People learn by doing. Hence, the program of learning for children and adults alike is related to life as it goes on outside the classroom (pp. vi-12)

Each (1924), a contemporary of Dewey, also stressed the idea that education could not be provided by school alone. It had to be a joint effort of the schools and the community:

Extract (1924), Clapp (1928), Cook (1941), and Blum (1944) were significant contributors in the community school movement. Their writings promoted the concept of the reciprocal nature of linking education with the community.

Long (1949, 1949) writing for the National Society for the Study of Education, described the community school concept:

"Community school" is the term currently applied to a school that has as its a major phase--service to the entire community. . . . and, therefore, development and use of resources of the community as part of the educational facilities of the school. The nature of the community school with local community is extended and is directed, the school's attention to local matters, but to provide a focus from which to relate study and action to the larger community--the state, the nation, the region and the world. (p. 209)

Many school/and teachers during the 1930's and 1940's felt keenly the need to revitalize the public education program to meet the needs of local communities. However, despite the advantages of working, few districts chose to adopt the community school concept.

In 1933, the First, Michigan schools initiated a community school program. With financial support from the Charles Stewart

Port Foundation, the Piles Board of Education developed and conducted educational programs of an enrichment and compulsory nature--programs based those actually undertaken by a public school system. Assuming that a child is molded and developed by his total environment, the Foundation supported a series of programs designed to uplift the entire population. Programs in health services for children, adult education, adult vocational, civic affairs, socialization, and recreation activities have been offered through the public schools. Within this concept, the school became much more than a kindergarten-like institution for youth. It became a community education center with programs in health, adult education, recreation, compulsory education, and enrichment for all the residents of the community (Clancy, 1968).

Port (1968) explained the community education philosophy in Piles as follows:

After 25 years of experimentation, the Port Foundation considers the public school the ideal instrument to achieve the end of community education. For the public school has played the traditional role of socializer in our society, and today is an institution truly representative of all classes, creeds, and colors. The physical plant of the schools, representing a huge community investment, are perfectly suited for community education and activities and the use of these facilities eliminates the need for costly duplication. The schools are geographically suited in terms of neighborhood centers of recreation, socialization and democratic action and by their nature are readily accessible to every man, woman and child. And if experimental programs can be proved feasible with a school system, the transition from private support to public support is relatively easy [pp. 181-182].

Sparked by the inquiries given by the Ford Foundation, community education has emerged into a comprehensive and dynamic concept. Clark and Dixon (1977) stated that

Ford's thinking about community education aims notes the contributions of several of writers and practitioners. Community education, simply stated, is an operational philosophy of education and a system for community development. It is comprehensive in scope and of high potential; equally applicable to any organization, neighborhood, or agency that provides learning opportunities for community members. It is a philosophy that subscribes to the systematic involvement of community members at all ages in the educational process. It further suggests the maximum utilization of all human, physical and financial resources of the community. It is a philosophy that stresses centralization and agency coordination and cooperation. It recognizes that learning is lifelong and that we provide various types of learning opportunities for community members, regardless of their ages. It is a philosophy that advocates democratic involvement of community members in problem-solving and stresses that educational opportunities, programs, and services should be community defined (pp. 81-88).

Campbell (1980) saw the community education coordinator as the connecting link between theory and practice:

He is the one person, perhaps more than any other, who interprets educational programs in the people, and once he receives values input to the central office the desire of the people in the neighborhood. . . . He and the principal get involved once the educational unit is made from members working with the government, education, and activities of the educational programs (pp. 48-49).

The operational setting of a community educator is the community. According to Kelly (1992), a well-developed community education program utilizes the number of hours spent both on and away from the community. The focus of the program

consists of the emphasis on interpersonal interaction with a variety of publics; the community educator must possess a high degree of sensitivity in dealing with others. The development of community education requires an underlying ability to provide leadership for community members as they work toward community educational goals.

Winsky and Lohrste (1989) stated it clearly:

The organizational structure may be developed in several ways, but must provide for excellent opportunities for every community member to be aware of what is happening and to discuss his concerns in a way that they will have impact on the proper people (p. 14).

To accomplish such a goal, it has been suggested (Rosen, 1982) that community education coordinators possess the socially preferred personality characteristics such as honesty, trustworthiness, etc. But above all, he should be trustworthy. He must be able to establish a relationship with all elements of the community built upon the highest level of trust. Much of the effectiveness of a community education coordinator depends upon the degree to which he can build good human relations. He must maintain a friendly atmosphere, encourage participation, and help people feel that they are a vital part of the community school. He must devise procedures that will enable people to

practice leadership skills and further develop their own leadership potential. (pp. 58-59)

Likewise, Clark and Stafford (1980) identified characteristic traits used by Bittner and Rylich to describe facilitation teachers, as keys to facilitation leadership for community educators. The interpersonal qualities were identified as follows:

(1) affective listening, focusing on the personal meaning that accompanies the spoken word, (2) genuineness, being yourself at all times, not playing roles, (3) understanding, being attuned to the personal use of other people, (4) respect, accepting each person as a human being without making judgment on him, (5) vulnerability, knowing how to lose and how to help others to lose, (6) skills in interpersonal communication, being aware of the impact of your words and actions on others. (p. 83)

Burke (1973) described a community education coordinator as an "encourager" or an "initiator." (p. 44) These terms were fitting, in fact his job requires the coordinator to encourage individuals, groups, agencies, and initiate one to become as deeply involved in the educational process. The coordinator is also the initiator in that he functions as the agent in facilitating each planning and implementing projects. His major task is to broaden the base of involvement within the community. To participate with families, the coordinator must exhibit behavior which is indicative of consideration and empathy for others in order to work in harmony with the public. Burke (1973) stated that:

to refuse him to participate setting  
downs, even in a hall and its hall-  
way, and cold springs. In effect,  
the subject matter is constantly keeping  
to such himself out of a job. (p. 47)

Rortan (1949) also only stated the role of a community  
education leader.

Most communities are denied the benefits  
of science by education because of a  
lack of leadership leaders. The de-  
velopment of leadership ability in the  
part of people of all ages is one of the  
major goals of community education. (p. 15)

Working with the community as equal partners in decision-  
making is essential to success of community education. However,  
developing such a relationship is no simple task.

A point often overlooked in discussions  
of community-education development is the  
key importance of the administrator her-  
self. (a) his professional orientation  
toward the relation of education and the  
community, (b) the kind of administrative  
behavior he displays, (c) his personal  
characteristics, and (d) the nature and  
extent of his professional preparation  
(Anderson and Davis, 1954, p. 98)

Ramsey (1975) suggested that community education training  
should stress skill development in the conceptual, human, and  
technical areas. Specifically he stated that training must  
enable the individual to

- (1) Develop ability to analyze the  
situation in the leadership situa-  
tion and select appropriate leader-  
ship styles
- (2) Develop and apply various styles of  
leadership
- (3) Develop personal requisites to com-  
munity education leadership

- (8) Develop industrial skills appropriate to community education leadership.
- (9) Develop home skills appropriate to community education leadership.
- (10) Develop statistical skills appropriate to community education leadership. (p. 24)

Kiley and LeTendre (1972) established similar criteria for community education coordinators. They indicated that the criteria could fall under four general headings: (a) understanding community education philosophy, (b) statistical skills for explaining community education, (c) home/industry relations, and (d) general administrative skills (pp. 134-138).

Kierulff (1974) used a questionnaire rating for developing the technical, conceptual, and home skills of 48 selected community education coordinators. In this study it was found that coordinators chosen as successful had a significantly longer number of seminar hours of course work in community education, had worked with community education a significantly longer period of time, and had significantly more interpersonal training in community education than did other coordinators.

### Summary

The review of selected related literature indicated that leadership can be interpreted through the occurrence of leader behavior. Little research has been done concerning the leader behavior of community education coordinators.

Community education is a growing movement in the field of education. The underlying basis to this philosophy is the

democratic involvement of community members in the decision-making process. Many of the writings acknowledge views the need for facilitative leadership as a key to effective performance. The training institutions which nurture community education leaders are providing technical, human, and conceptual skills which should enable the community-based leaders to exhibit behaviors indicative of facilitative leadership.

Facilitative leader behaviors are essential to the development of leadership ability in community members. Active leadership by community members is necessary for effective community education development. The focus of this research effort was to analyze the leader behavior of selected community education coordinators in Florida. The ability to predict leader behavior by identifying specific personal data would enable administrators to select those individuals best prepared to deal with the requirements of the community education role.



## CHAPTER III

### FINDINGS OF THE LBSQ--RIS

The analysis of data we set forth in chapter I is reported in this chapter. Data for analysis were drawn from administration of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form RIS. The LBSQ--RIS was administered to five members of each participating coordinator's advisory council. Each coordinator completed the personal data form.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to answer the 12 questions concerning the differences in leader behavior based on the personal data variables. A follow-up test was done as those variables found to be significant using Tukey's RSD procedure. The significance level was set at .05. Each question was answered on the basis of the ratings of the participating coordinators provided by the advisory council members.

Two computer programs were run using the SPSS/VS Package for the Social Sciences<sup>®</sup> (Nashville, TN). The first analysis was used to identify the mean scores and standard deviation of all the coordinators on each of the 12 constructed factor scores were assigned to categories based on their responses in the personal data variables. The coordinators were then compared by groups and a test for statistical independence differences among groups was performed in the second computer run.

### Summary of The 1999-2001 Results

Of the 100 questionnaires distributed, 75 were received, yielding a total return rate of 75%. Fifteen of the 36 supervisors chosen actually participated. Table 1-6 indicates the results of the responses on the 1999-2001 by behavior construct. Statistical analysis of the 1999-2001 results were applied to each of the 12 behavior constructs and interpreted using a one-way analysis of variance and the Tukey-BSS procedure. Tests were run for comparisons on the basis of the personal data variables. For the purposes of these analyses the responses on the personal data variable of training were grouped. The responses to academic community education training and a full year internship were grouped as academic training. The responses to two-week workshops and bi-monthly workshops were grouped as bi-monthly workshops. The category of supervised field experience had no responses. The category of on-the-job training was used intact. The results of the analysis are reviewed by each of the 12 leader behavior constructs.

### Summary of the 2002-2003 Results

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the advisory council members, between the perceived degree to which community education coordinators speak and act as the representative of the group. Table 1-1 reports the results of the responses for the first construct when the supervisors are grouped by the personal data variable of sex. The results indicated that the difference between the males and females was not significant at the .05 level. Table

Table 1 reports the results of the responses for the French concept *visuel* when the combinations are grouped by the person's *âge* (available at age).

TABLE 1. *âge* (1993-1994) (1995-96)

Category	Person Score	Age Score	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Representations	32.00	42.00	44.15	4.14
Segment Representation	32.00	48.00	40.00	3.14
Tolerance of Uncertainty	35.00	44.00	39.00	2.43
Perseverance	30.00	45.00	40.50	2.28
Initiation of Structure	34.00	44.00	40.00	2.30
Tolerance of Freedom	34.00	43.00	41.43	2.40
Role Retention	32.00	42.00	41.50	4.20
Consideration	38.00	44.00	40.71	2.00
Predictive Reasoning	31.00	39.00	34.87	2.16
Predictive Accuracy	38.00	45.00	40.00	2.43
Integration	36.00	48.00	42.43	3.44
Superior Reasoning	38.00	43.00	35.86	2.34

*n* = 14

TABLE 2. *représentation*

Variables	Total <i>n</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>F</i> Male	<i>F</i> Femle
Male	9	42.22	1.3	0.011
Female	5	39.40		

The results indicate that the difference between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level. Table 2 reports the results of the responses for the French concept *représentation* when the combinations are grouped by gender (available at *âge*).

TABLE 1.1--REPRESENTATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$ Basis	$p$ Level
Age: 18-35	3	40.00	0.2	0.798
Age: 36-45	6	40.00		
Age: 46-over	6	40.00		

TABLE 1.2--EXPERIENCE

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$ Basis	$p$ Level
Experience: less than three years	5	35.71	0.2	0.813
Experience: 3-5 years	6	40.00		
Experience: over 5 years	3	37.00		

community education coordinator. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level. Table 1.2 reports the results of the responses for the first question when the coordinators are grouped by type of community education training. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 1.3--REPRESENTATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$ Basis	$p$ Level
Training: audience	3	41.00	0.4	0.132
Training: co-ordinator	6	38.00		
Training: another job	6	41.00		

Table 1.3 reports the results of the responses for the first question when the coordinators are grouped according to the

type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the three experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Variable	Level	n	F	Prob.
Previous experience elementary	1	40 18	0.4	0.408
Previous experience secondary	2	40 37		
Previous experience other	3	43 88		

The sixth variable of previous goal aspiration was not analyzed for any of the constructs. Thirteen of the coordinators held professional aspirations of becoming public school principals. Three of the coordinators each listed three different professional aspirations: a certified public accountant, a college professor, a trainer of community education coordinators. Because of the break down of the grouping, a statistical comparison was not considered.

#### Construct 2: Second Socialization

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the advisory council members between the perceived degree to which community education coordinators recognize conflicting demands and reduce disorder in the system. Table 2.1 reports the results of the responses for the first construct when the coordinators are grouped according to the personal data variable age. The results

indicate that the difference between the males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2.2--SEXES RECONCILIATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$	
			Males	Females
Male	9	44.66	1.1	0.098
Female	6	41.16		

Table 2.3 reports the results of the responses for the second construct when the coordinators was grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2.3--AGES RECONCILIATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$	
			Males	Females
Age 21-32	3	43.53	1.2	0.519
Age 33-42	4	41.50		
Age 43-over	4	44.12		

Table 2.4 reports the results of the responses for the second construct when the coordinators was grouped by years experience as a community education coordinator. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2.4--YEARS RECONCILIATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$	
			Males	Females
Experience less than three years	5	41.33	1.2	0.192
Experience 3-4 years	6	41.70		
Experience over 4 years	3	44.33		

Table 2.4 reports the results of the responses for the second question when the coordinators are grouped by type of previous experience (training). The results indicate that the difference between the three answers was not significant at the 05 level.

TABLE 2.4 - SECOND RECONCILIATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$	
			Asilo	Prob.
Training: elementary	3	42.00	1.0	0.110
Training: intermediate	4	41.00		
Training: no-one-job	4	44.75		

Table 2.5 reports the results of the responses for the second question when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the three experience categories was not significant at the 05 level.

TABLE 2.5 - SECOND RECONCILIATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$	
			Asilo	Prob.
Previous experience: elementary	3	41.75	0.9	0.427
Previous experience: secondary	4	42.00		
Previous experience: other	4	43.00		

### Construct 3: Tolerance of Aggression

There was no significant difference at the 05 level in the ratings as reported by the advisory council members, between the perceived degree to which community education

coordination skills, while he performs accurately and continuously without anxiety and upset.

Table 3.1 reports the results of the responses for the third construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of sex. The results indicate that the differences between males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.1--TWO-WAY TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	F Prob
Male	9	15.11	15	0.161
Female	6	15.16		

Table 3.2 reports the results of the responses for the third construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the differences between the three age subgroups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.2--TWO-WAY TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	F Prob
Age: 21-30	3	41.83	1.5	0.188
Age: 31-40	6	15.18		
Age: 41-over	4	15.17		

Table 3.3 reports the results of the responses for the third construct when the coordinators are grouped by years experience as a community education coordinator. The results indicate that the differences between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.



TABLE 3.3--TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	F Prob.
Experience: less than 3 years	5	18.16	1.8	0.007
Experience: 3-6 years	8	40.13		
Experience: over 6 years	5	13.48		

Table 3.3 reports the results of the responses for the third construct when the coordinators are grouped by type of community adaptation training. The results indicate that the differences between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.4--TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	F Prob.
Training: Academic	5	46.87	3.4	0.004
Training: In-service	8	38.80		
Training: On-the-job	6	40.16		

Table 3.4 reports the results of the responses for the third construct when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the differences between the three experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.3--TOLERANCE OF VARIABILITY

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	Male	Female
Previous experience elementary	9	48.5	21	2.487
Previous experience secondary	8	52.5		
Previous experience other	6	35.8		

Constraint 4: Persuasiveness

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings, as reported by the advisory council members, regarding the perceived degree to which community education coordinators use persuasive and argument effectively when the coordinators were grouped by sex, age, training, and previous experience. However, a significant difference was found when the coordinators were grouped according to years experience as a community education coordinator. Table 4.1 reports the results of responses to the fourth constraint when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of sex. The results indicate that the difference between males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.1--PERSUASIVENESS

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	Male	Female
Male	9	40.18	12	2.418
Female	4	41.52		

Table 4.2 reports the results of the response to the fourth construct when the coordinators were grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.2--PERSONALISTEMAS

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma$ Ratio	$\chi^2$ Prob
Age 30-39	3	40.33	.31	2.762
Age 40-49	4	40.50		
Age 50 and over	4	39.75		

Table 4.3 reports the results of the fourth construct when the coordinators are grouped by years experience as a community education coordinator. These coordinators with over six years experience were perceived to use persuasion and argument significantly less than those coordinators with less than three years experience and those coordinators with three to six years experience. Using the Tukey-KSD procedure, those coordinators with less than three years experience and those coordinators with three to six years experience did not differ significantly.

TABLE 4.3--PERSONALISTEMAS

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma$ Ratio	$\chi^2$ Prob
Experience less than 3 years	3	40.40	.117	6.844
Experience 3-6 years	4	41.18		
Experience over 6 years	3	38.33*		

\*Group 3 differed significantly from groups 1 and 2

Table 4.4 reports the results of the fourth comparison when the coordinators are grouped by type of secondary education training. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.4--FINDINGS (N=5)

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$ Sample	$\bar{P}$ F-test
Training: secondary	5	40.40	1.4	0.041
Training: in-service	6	38.33		
Training: on-the-job	6	41.83		

Table 4.5 reports the results of the comparison for the fourth comparison when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.5--FINDINGS (N=5)

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$ Sample	$\bar{P}$ F-test
Previous experience: elementary	3	41.67	24	0.457
Previous experience: secondary	3	39.33		
Previous experience: other	4	42.25		

### Statement 5: Initiation of Structure

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the voluntary council members, between the perceived degree to which the intensity education coordinators

clearly define *STRESS* using the same technique, then will be expected of the other two coordinators who grouped by race, age, and gender (30.27/30.6). However, a significant difference was found when coordinators were grouped according to gender and years experience in a community education experience. Table 3.1 reports the results of the responses for the fifth ANOVA when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of sex. The results indicate that the difference between the males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.1--INITIATION OF STRESSORS

Variable	Total n	T	F	P
Male	3	41.31	79	0.394
Female	4	40.83		

Table 3.2 reports the results of the responses for the fifth ANOVA when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.2--INITIATION OF STRESSORS

Variable	Total n	T	F	P
Age: 21-29	3	40.88	81	0.887
Age: 31-40	4	40.37		
Age: 41-50+	4	41.13		

Table 3.3 reports the results of the responses for the fifth ANOVA when the coordinators are grouped by years experience

as a community education coordinator. These coordinators with three to six years experience in community education were presumed to exhibit behavior which more closely defined their role and for this reason knew what is expected of them than their coordinators with less than three years experience and those coordinators with more than six years experience.

TABLE 3.3--INITIATION OF STRUCTURE

Variable	Total n	T	F Ratio	p
Experience: less than 3 years	5	28.68	12.4	0.008
Experience: 3-6 years	4	42.78*		
Experience: more than 6 years	3	34.78		
Group 2 differs significantly from groups 1 and 3				

Table 3.4 reports the results of the responses for the fifth construct when the coordinators are grouped by type of community education training. The results indicate that the difference between the groups was significant at the .05 level. However, when the Tukey-B procedure was applied, none of the three groups were found to differ significantly from each other.

TABLE 3.4--INITIATION OF STRUCTURE

Variable	Total n	T	F Ratio	p
Training: randomly	3	41.07*	5.05	0.018
Training: in-service	5	28.42*		
Training: on-the-job	4	42.43*		
No group differs significantly from the other based on Tukey procedure				

Table 5.5 reports the ratings (at 95% confidence) of the 1110 members when the coordinators are grouped according to the previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 5.5--UTILIZATION OF STRUCTURE

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Prob.
Previous experience: elementary	3	41.27	.18	0.846
Previous experience: secondary	8	40.44		
Previous experience: other	4	41.00		

#### Construct 6: Importance of Tradition

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the advisory council members for those the perceived degree to which the community education coordinators allow followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. Table 6.1 reports the results of the responses for the sixth construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of sex. The results indicate that the difference between the males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 6.1--TOLERANCE OF PARTISAN

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Prob.
Male	3	46.33	.33	0.988
Female	4	46.25		

Table 4.2 reports the results of the responses for the slash construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal characteristics of age. The results indicate that the differences between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.2--TOLERANCE OF FRUSTRATION

Variables	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	p-Value
Age: 21-30	3	43.66	2.0	0.175
Age: 31-40	6	48.00		
Age: 41-over	6	48.16		

Table 4.3 reports the results of the responses for the slash construct when the coordinators are grouped by years of previous as a teacher or educational coordinator. The results indicate that the differences between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.3--TOLERANCE OF FRUSTRATION

Variables	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	p-Value
Experience: less than 3 years	3	41.33	0.3	0.879
Experience: 3-6 years	4	45.50		
Experience: more 6 years	4	38.50		

Table 4.4 reports the results of the responses for the slash construct when the coordinators are grouped by the type of community education training. The results indicate that the differences between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.



TABLE 4.4--TRIGRAMS OF PREDIORS

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F	P
Training: classroom	3	45.55	1.0	0.375
Training: in-service	4	48.50		
Training: on-the-job				

Table 4.4 reports the results of the stem construct when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.5--TRIGRAMS OF PREDIORS

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F	P
Previous experience/ classroom	3	45.55	.0	0.973
Previous experience/ in-service	4	47.50		
Previous experience/ other	4	46.25		

#### EXPERIENCE 7: ROLE RECOGNITION

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the advisory council members, between the perceived degree to which community education coordinators actually exercise the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. Table 7.1 reports the results of the responses for the seventh construct when the subdimensions are grouped by the parental role variable of sex. The results indicate that the difference between males and females was not

significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2.1--RHS RETENTION

Variable	Total n	T	F	p
Age	9	41.53	14	0.718
Female	8	40.58		

Table 2.1 reports the results of the variance constructs when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2.2--RHS RETENTION

Variable	Total n	T	F	p
Age: 21-30	3	42.88	38	0.744
Age: 31-40	4	40.75		
Age: 41-over	2	40.28		

Table 2.2 reports the results of the responses for the variance constructs when the coordinators are grouped by years experience as a nurse or education coordinator. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2.3--RHS RETENTION

Variable	Total n	T	F	p
Experience: less than 3 years	3	40.88	1.4	0.212
Experience: 3-6 years	4	41.58		
Experience: over 6 years	2	38.00		

Table 2.4 reports the results of the responses for the seventh construct when the coordinators are grouped by type of community education training. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2.4--SEVENTH CONSTRUCT

Variable	Total n	T	F	
			Basic	Book
Training: none/no	3	19.33	42	0.105
Training: in-the-class	6	41.50		
Training: on-the-job	6	43.50		

Table 2.5 reports the results of the responses for the seventh construct when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the three categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2.5--SEVENTH CONSTRUCT

Variable	Total n	T	F	
			Basic	Book
Previous experience: elementary	3	42.33	2.8	0.010
Previous experience: secondary	6	39.17		
Previous experience: other	4	46.50		

### Construct 8--Qualifications

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the advisory council members, although the perceived degree to which community education coordinators regard the coordinators' skill base, status and description of

Following, Table 8.1 reports the results of the responses for the eighth question when the coordinators are grouped according to the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 8.1--COORDINATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$	
			Male	Female
Male	5	44.80	14	0.434
Female	5	44.36		

Table 8.2 reports the results of the responses for the eighth question when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 8.2--COORDINATION

Sample	Total n	$\bar{X}$	$\chi^2$	
			Male	Female
Age 10-19	5	44.80	20	0.981
Age 20-40	5	44.80		
Age 40-over	5	44.36		

Table 8.3 reports the results of the responses for the eighth question when the coordinators are grouped by years as a primary education coordinator. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.3--COORDINATORS

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	F Prob
Experience: less than 3 years	3	58.00	3.4	0.040
Experience: 3-6 years	6	63.50		
Experience: over 6 years	6	62.16		

Table 3.4 reports the results of the responses for the eighth question when the coordinators are grouped by type of secondary education training. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.4--COORDINATORS

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	F Prob
Training: apprentice	3	63.33	1.0	0.387
Training: intermediate	6	63.75		
Training: on-the-job	6	63.66		

Table 3.5 reports the results of the responses for the eighth question when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the three experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.5--COORDINATORS

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F Ratio	F Prob
Previous experience: elementary	3	56.33	14	0.003
Previous experience: secondary	3	56.33		
Previous experience: other	6	62.75		

### Construct 3: Production Incentive

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the advisory council members, for those the personnel degree to which community education coordinators apply pressure for productive output. Table 3.1 reports the results of the responses for the single construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of sex. The results indicate that the difference between males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.1--PRODUCTION INCENTIVE

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F	Prob.
Male	3	34.33	.01	.9183
Female	4	34.50		

Table 3.2 reports the results of the responses for the single construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the differences between the three age groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.2--PRODUCTION INCENTIVE

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F	Prob.
Age: 11-34	3	33.33	1.0	.9183
Age: 35-40	4	33.25		
Age: 41-over	4	34.50		

Table 3.3 reports the results of the responses for the single construct when the coordinators are grouped by years experience as a community education coordinator. The results indicate

that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.3- PRODUCTION EXPERIANCE

Variable	Total n	X	S <sub>sq</sub> ss	F <sub>calc</sub>
Experience: less than 3 years	3	34.33	80	4.981
Experience: 3-6 years	4	34.75		
Experience: more 6 years	4	34.90		

Table 3.3 reports the results of the responses for the sixth construct when the respondents were grouped by type of on-the-job acquisition training. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3.4- PRODUCTION EXPERIANCE

Variable	Total n	X	S <sub>sq</sub> ss	F <sub>calc</sub>
Training: simulated	3	38.66	81	8.498
Training: in-service	4	34.85		
Training: on-the-job	4	38.75		

Table 3.4 reports the results of the responses for the sixth construct when the respondents are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the three experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

#### Construct 18- Production Accuracy

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the subjects' overall means, for both the perceived degree to which simulated education

TABLE 13.1--PREDICTIVE ACCURACY

Variable	Total n	$\bar{Y}$	F Ratio	F Prob.
Previous experience elementary	3	34.60	1.3	0.303
Previous experience secondary	8	35.87		
Previous experience other	4	31.75		

coordinators submit forecasts and ability to predict outcomes accurately. Table 13.1 reports the results of the responses for the teach construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 13.2--PREDICTIVE ACCURACY

Variable	Total n	$\bar{Y}$	F Ratio	F Prob.
Male	5	35.84	50	0.466
Female	4	46.50		

Table 13.2 reports the results of the responses for the teach construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 13.3--PREDICTIVE ACCURACY

Variable	Total n	$\bar{Y}$	F Ratio	F Prob.
Age: 21-30	3	30.33	1.4	0.346
Age: 31-40	8	41.43		
Age: 41+over	6	39.33		



Table 18.3 reports the results of the responses for the tenth construct when the coordinators are grouped by years of experience as a community adaptation coordinator. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 18.3--PREDICTIVE ACCURACY

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	r	r <sup>2</sup>
Experience: less than 3 years	3	29.44	2.8	0.993
Experience: 3-6 years	3	41.44		
Experience: over 6 years	3	53.44		

Table 18.4 reports the results of the responses for the tenth construct when the coordinators are grouped by type of community adaptation training. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 18.4--PREDICTIVE ACCURACY

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	r	r <sup>2</sup>
Training: academic	3	39.44	3.8	0.433
Training: on-the-job	3	39.53		
Training: another job	3	46.44		

Table 18.5 reports the results of the responses for the tenth construct when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the three experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 10.1--PERCEIVED AGE DIFFERENCE

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F	Prob.
Previous experience elementary	3	41.33	2.1	0.134
Previous experience secondary	8	38.38		
Previous experience other	4	48.25		

Conclusion 10. Integrating

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the elementary school members, between the perceived degree to which community education coordinators maintain a closely knit organization and receive intermember conflict. Table 10.1 reports the results of the responses for the eleven members when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of sex. The results indicate that the difference between males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 11.1--INTERACTION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F	Prob.
Male	3	43.33	4.7	0.030
Female	8	41.38		

Table 11.2 reports the results of the responses for the eleven members when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the three age categories was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 11.2--INTEGRATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	t	Prob.
Age: 21-30	3	41.00	.00	0.904
Age: 31-40	4	42.75		
Age: 41-over	4	41.75		

Table 11.2 reports the results of the responses for the eleventh statement when the coordinators are grouped by years of experience as a community education coordinator. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 11.3--INTEGRATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	t	Prob.
Experience: less than 3 years	3	41.00	0.2	0.881
Experience: 3-4 years	4	44.25		
Experience: over 4 years	4	55.50		

Table 11.3 reports the results of the responses for the eleventh statement when the coordinators are grouped by type of community education training. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 11.4--INTEGRATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	t	Prob.
Training: academic	3	44.67	1.1	0.336
Training: internship	4	46.25		
Training: on-the-job	4	45.00		

Table 11.1 reports the results of the responses for the twelfth construct when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the three experience groups was not significant at the .05 level.

Table 11.1. INTERACTION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	S	F
Previous experience elementary	3	40.50	1.0	0.185
Previous experience secondary	8	40.13		
Previous experience other	4	44.50		

#### Construct 13: Superior Orientation

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the ratings as reported by the advisory council members, between the perceived degree to which community education coordinators maintain cordial relations with superiors, have influence over them, and are striving for higher status when the coordinators are grouped by sex, age, income, and previous experience. However, a significant difference was found when the coordinators were grouped according to years experience as a community education coordinator. Table 12.1 reports the results of the responses for the twelfth construct when the coordinators are grouped according to the personal data variable of sex. The results indicate that the difference between the males and females was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 12.1--SUPERVISOR ORIENTATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F	P
			Ratio	Prob.
Male	9	39.55	.26	0.618
Female	6	40.50		

Table 12.1 reports the results of the responses for the conflict construct when the coordinators are grouped by the personal data variable of age. The results indicate that the difference between the three age groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 12.2--SUPERVISOR ORIENTATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	F	P
			Ratio	Prob.
Age: 15-30	9	39.22	.26	0.628
Age: 31-40	6	40.16		
Age: 40-over	6	39.58		

Table 12.2 reports the results of the conflict construct when the coordinators are grouped by years experience as a community education coordinator. The results indicate that those community education coordinators with more than ten years experience are perceived to be less concerned with maintaining cordial relations with superiors, having influence over them, and striving for higher status than coordinators with less than three years experience and those coordinators with three to six years experience. In addition, those coordinators with three to six years experience are perceived to be more concerned with maintaining cordial relations with superiors, having influence over them, and striving for higher status than those

coordinators with less than three years experience and three coordinators with more than six years experience.

TABLE 12.3--SUPERVISED ORIENTATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	Range	Prob.
Experience: less than 3 years	3	18.83*	4-5	0.014
Experience: 3-6 years	5	40.18*		
Experience: over 6 years	5	16.18*		

\*Each group differs signif. sample from the other

Table 12.4 reports the results of the twelfth construct when the coordinators are grouped by type of community education training. The results indicate that the difference between the three groups was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 12.4--SUPERVISED ORIENTATION

Variable	Total n	$\bar{X}$	Range	Prob.
Training: academic	3	41.56	1-7	0.108
Training: on-the-job	4	38.75		
Training: no-the-job	5	40.80		

Table 12.5 reports the results of the twelfth construct when the coordinators are grouped according to the type of previous experience they have had. The results indicate that the difference between the three experience categories was not significant at the .05 level.

A Pearson Product-Moment correlation was computed to determine if a relationship existed between the variables under study. For the purpose of this comparison, the level of

TABLE 12.3--SUPERIOR ORIENTATION

Variable	Total n	T	Significance	Power
Previous experience/ elementary	3	41.81	0.2	0.108
Previous experience/ secondary	8	37.83		
Previous experience/ other	4	33.48		

significance was .05. The mean score on each of the 12 behavior constructs was used for this procedure. Table 12.3 reports the results of the correlation matrix. The results indicate a significant relationship between two of the personal data variables as well as eight of the 12 behavior constructs.

### Summary

Data from the leader behavior description questionnaire--III were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance to answer each of the 12 questions concerning the differences in leader behavior based on the personal data variables. The .05 level of significance was used for each of the constructs. Findings from this procedure indicated that of the 12 constructs only Persuasiveness, isolation of resources, and Superior Orientation were affected by the personal data variables.

Persuasiveness was found to be significantly different when the coordinators were grouped by the number of years experience. Those with over six years experience were significantly less persuasive than those with less than three years and those with three to six years.

[illegible][illegible]



Initiation of structure was found to be significantly different when coordinators were grouped according to experience and training. Those coordinators with three to six years experience exhibited behavior initiation of initiation of structure more frequently than those with less than three years and those with over six years. When the coordinators were grouped by training, a significant difference was also found between the groups. However, the more conservative Tukey post-hoc test revealed that none were more significant than the others.

Superior Subordination was found to be significantly different when coordinators were grouped according to experience. Those coordinators with more than six years experience were less concerned with initiation of structure than those coordinators with three to six years experience. In addition, those with three to six years experience were more concerned with initiation of structure than those coordinators with less than three years and those coordinators with more than six years.

In brief, the personal data variable of experience affected significant differences in three categories while the personal data variable of training affected only one category. The additional personal data variable produced no significant differences across any of the 12 leader behavior subdimensions.

The findings of the survey of assigned authorities and the data from the 180-2-21 will be presented in chapter 10.

## CHAPTER IV

### DESIGN OF THE LEADER BEHAVIOR PROFILE

The findings presented in this chapter address the second part of a two-part research problem. The data contained herein report the results of the survey of national authorities as well as an analysis of variance between the ideal behavior as perceived by national authorities and the actual behavior of community education coordinators as perceived by community advisory council members. Data for analysis were drawn from administration of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--RII and the Leader Behavior Profile. The LBQ--RII was administered to members of each participating coordinator's advisory council. The Leader Behavior Profile was administered to the members of Councils for Community Education in universities throughout the nation.

A one-way analysis of variance using a single linear regression procedure was used to assess the variation concerning the differences in "ideal" behavior as perceived by the national authorities and the "actual" behavior of coordinators as perceived by the community advisory council members. The significance level for this analysis was set at .01.

These computer programs were run using the Statistical Picking for the Social Sciences--PSPK/MS, Release 3.0.

Effect coding was used so the raw data is comparable to the original number between the two groups. Raw scores for the two groups were converted to z-scores. This conversion allowed the sets of data to be standardized thus, conforming to the assumption of homogeneity of variance and standardized mean scores necessary for analysis of variance.

Three computer programs were run. The first two runs were used to compute the mean scores and standard deviation for both the master directors and coordinators on each of the 12 categories. In the third run, master directors and coordinators were compared using a one-way analysis of variance with a simple linear regression procedure to test for significant differences in each of the 12 behavior categories.

#### Summary of Leader Behavior Profile Results

All the 12 questionnaire distributed, 43 were returned, yielding a total return rate of 96%. Table 14.1 reports the results of the responses on the Leader Behavior Profile. The results indicate that the master directors consider Toleration of Friction--the degree to which the coordinators allow followers scope for exit, stress, dissidence, and action, as ideally being the most important category of behavior. In addition, the results indicate that the master directors consider Self-Satisfaction--the degree to which the coordinators actively exercise the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others, as ideally being the least important category of behavior.

Table 1. Community Advisory Panels Results (2006)

Category	Business SCEs	Service SCEs	Non- SCEs	Standard Deviation
Representation	18.88	38.88	23.11	13.76
Demand Reconciliation	18.88	68.88	21.77	10.18
Reliance of Uncertainty	18.88	38.88	21.88	11.46
Personnelness	18.88	38.88	23.77	13.48
Initiation of Structure	18.88	38.88	38.88	18.77
Tolerance of Friction	18.88	38.88	38.88 <sup>a</sup>	13.18
Role Definition	18.88	38.88	14.44 <sup>a</sup>	8.85
Consideration	18.88	38.88	14.88	7.83
Production Emphasis	88.88	38.88	17.33	18.85
Production Absence	88.88	68.88	14.88	9.88
Integration	88.88	38.88	18.88	18.88
Superior Delegation	18.88	68.88	23.33	18.33

a = 43

<sup>a</sup> = most important category of "ideal" behavior

<sup>a</sup> = least important category of "ideal" behavior

Table 14.1 reports the results of the responses to the questionnaire as previously reported in chapter 11. The results indicate that the most frequent actual behavior exhibited by the community education coordinators was in the category of consideration—the perceived degree to which the coordinator regards the comfort, well-being, needs, and contribution of followers. In addition, the results indicate that the least frequent actual behavior exhibited by the community education coordinators was in the category of Production Emphasis—the

described earlier in Table 15, the Transformation Factor, and the predicted change.

TABLE 15, 2--1982--21: RESULTS FACTORS

Category	Best Score	Realized Score	Score Gain	Standard Deviation
Representation	32.00	42.00	10.00	4.00
Removal Redundancies	32.00	48.00	16.00	3.00
Reduction of Uncertainty	36.00	44.00	08.00	2.00
Performance	32.00	45.00	13.00	3.00
Refinement of Structure	34.00	48.00	14.00	2.00
Refinement of Function	38.00	45.00	07.00	2.00
Role Selection	32.00	42.00	10.00	4.00
Consideration	38.00	46.00	08.00 <sup>a</sup>	2.00
Production Explored	38.00	39.00	01.00 <sup>a</sup>	2.00
Predictive Accuracy	34.00	45.00	11.00	2.00
Integration	34.00	42.00	08.00	3.00
Superior Presentation	35.00	43.00	08.00	2.00

n = 15

<sup>a</sup> = most frequent category of "actual" behavior

<sup>b</sup> = least frequent category of "actual" behavior

Table 15.1 reports the responses of the center directors on the Leader Behavior Profile after the conversion to matrix. Table 15.2 reports the responses for the committee adoption coordinators on the 180°--21 after the conversion to a matrix. This conversion was necessary to provide for homogeneity of variance and standard deviation scores.

TABLE 15. 1--2 SCORE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DIRECTOR (IDEAL)

Category	Director Mean	Director Score	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Representativeness	+2.85	1.00	+ 82	.64
General Accomplishment	+1.85	1.00	+ 82	.62
Tolerance of Uncertainty	+3.85	1.00	84	1.04
Persuasiveness	+2.85	2.88	+ 83	1.04
Initiation of Structure	+3.85	1.88	87	1.17
Tolerance of Freedom	+3.85	1.88	+ 86	1.18
Self-Deprecation	+2.85	2.88	+1.55	.88
Consideration	+2.85	1.88	+ .57	.75
Production Emphasis	+3.85	1.88	+2.14	1.62
Proactive Behavior	+2.85	2.88	+ .15	1.14
Integration	+2.85	1.88	+2.88	1.58
Superior Delegation	+2.85	2.88	+ .44	1.34

n = 65

Table 15 & repeats a summary of the results of the analysis of variance between the director dimension "ideal" and the subordinates' "actual" behavior of the 12 categories. 85 were found to be significantly different at the .05 level. Self-Deprecation of Uncertainty and Tolerance of Freedom were not significantly different between superior directors and subordinates.

TABLE 14. 1--2-DEGREE COMPARISONS--CORRELATIONS (CONT'D.)

Category	Minimum Range	Maximum Value	Mean Range	Standard Deviation
Representation	80	1.00	73	468
Gender Discrimination	1.00	2.00	1.18	468
Tolerance of Diversity	80	1.00	13	310
Persecution	80	1.00	13	468
Tolerance of Structure	80	1.00	18	414
Tolerance of Freedom	-1.00	.00	- .12	310
Risk Aversion	80	1.00	13	468
Cooperation	80	1.00	88	310
Production Emphasis	-1.00	.00	- .88	310
Predictive Accuracy	1.00	2.00	1.48	.507
Integration	-1.00	1.00	.00	737
Superior Orientation	1.00	2.00	1.33	818
n = 16				

#### Category 1c: Representation

There was a significant difference at the .01 level in degree of importance the senior directors identified with the category of Representation and the degree to which administrators actually speak and act as the representative of the group. Table 14.1 reports the results of the analysis for the category of Representation. The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicated that administrators' actual behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the senior directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

TABLE 13. 2--ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE "IDEAL" - "ACTUAL"

Category	F	Significance
Representative	14.45	*
Controlled Reconciliation	43.87	*
Tolerance of Ambiguity	7.47	n.s.
Personnel	14.15	*
Initiation of Structure	11.77	*
Tolerance of Freedom	2.57	n.s.
Role Definition	106.68	*
Consideration	18.80	*
Production Emphasis	58.45	*
Predictive Accuracy	48.42	*
Integration	28.88	*
Superior Orientation	38.58	*

\* = .05

TABLE 14. 1--REPRESENTATION

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	S.D.	F Ratio
Senior Director (ideal)	1.88	1.14	1.28	14.45
Coordinator (actual)	.73	.68		

Category 2a. Control Reconciliation

There was a significant difference at the .01 level in the degree of importance the senior directors identified with the category of Control Reconciliation and the degree to which the coordinators actually reconcile conflicting demands and reduce disorder in the system. Table 14.2 reports the results of the



analysis for the category of Sexual Recconciliation. The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the coordinators' school behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the senior directors' rating of their ideal behavior.

TABLE 18.2--SEXUAL RECONCILIATION

Group	Mean		S.D.	F
	Score	Deviation		Test
Senior Directors (ideal)	4.88	1.18	1.38	41.12
Coordinators (actual)	5.18	1.38		

### Category 3. Tolerance of Uncertainty

There was no significant difference at the .01 level in the degree of importance the senior directors identified with the category of Tolerance of Uncertainty and the actual degree to which the coordinators are able to tolerate uncertainty and progression without anxiety and upset. Table 18.3 reports the results of the analysis for the category of Tolerance of Uncertainty.

TABLE 18.3--TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY

Group	Mean		S.D.	F
	Score	Deviation		Test
Senior Directors (ideal)	4.4	1.18	1.38	7.87
Coordinators (actual)	4.5	1.38		

The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was not significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the coordinators' actual behavior was associated with the senior directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

### Category 4: Persuasiveness

There was a significant difference at the .01 level in the degree of importance the cancer directors identified with the category of Persuasiveness and the degree to which the coordinators actually used persuasion and argument effectively and exhibited strong convictions. Table 10.4 reports the results of the analysis for the category of Persuasiveness.

Table 10.4: Persuasiveness

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	$t_{df}$	P Prob
Cancer Directors (ideal)	~ 82	1.25	1.58	28.12
Coordinators (actual)	73	.458		

The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the coordinators' actual behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the cancer directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

### Category 5: Initiation of Structure

There was a significant difference at the .01 level in the degree of importance the cancer directors identified with the category of initiation of Structure and the degree to which the coordinators actually clearly define their own role and allow followers to know what is expected of them. Table 10.5 reports the results of the analysis for the category of Initiation of Structure. The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the coordinators' actual behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the cancer directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

TABLE 14-5--TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM

Group	Mean		S.D.	F Prob.
	Score	Rankings		
Senior Directors (Ideal)	91	1.12	1.58	10.77
Coordinators (Actual)	88	.514		

### Category 5. Tolerance of Freedom

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the degree of importance the senior directors identified with the category of tolerance of freedom and the extent to which the coordinators allow followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. Table 14-5 reports the results of the analysis for the category of tolerance of freedom. The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was not significant at the .05 level. This indicates that the coordinators' actual behavior was consistent with the senior directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

TABLE 14-6--TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM

Group	Mean		S.D.	F Prob.
	Score	Rankings		
Senior Directors (Ideal)	1.44	1.53	1.58	3.47
Coordinators (Actual)	1.13	.583		

### Category 7. Role Assumption

There was a significant difference at the .05 level in the degree of importance the senior directors identified with the category of role assumption and the degree to which the coordinators actually actively exercise the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. Table 14-7 reports the results of the analysis for the category of Role Assumption.

TABLE 14. PERCEIVED DIFFERENCE

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t (df)	P Prob
Center Directors (Ideal)	4.55	598	1.38	194.88
Coordinators (actual)	73	438		

The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the coordinators' actual behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the center directors' rating of ideal behavior.

#### Category B: Consideration

There was a significant difference at the .01 level in the degree of importance the center directors identified with the category of Consideration and the degree to which the coordinators actually regard the center's well-being, stated, and contribution of followers. Table 16.8 reports the results of the analysis for the category of Consideration.

TABLE 16.8. CONSIDERATION

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t (df)	P Prob
Center Directors (Ideal)	4.52	355	1.58	28.82
Coordinators (actual)	64	332		

The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the coordinators' actual behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the center directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

#### Category C: Production Emphasis

There was a significant difference at the .01 level in the degree of importance the center directors identified with the

category of Production Expenses and the degree to which the coordinators actually apply pressure for production output. Table 15.9 reports the results of the analysis for the category of Production Expenses.

TABLE 15.9--PRODUCTION EXPENSES

Group	Mean	Standard	S.E.	F
	Score	Deviation		
Center Directors (ideal)	-0.24	1.00	0.08	40.43
Coordinators (actual)	-0.44	.383		

The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the center directors' actual behavior was more frequent than the center coordinators' rating of the ideal behavior.

#### Category 14--Predictive Accuracy

There was a significant difference at the .05 level in the degree of importance the center directors identified with the category of Predictive Accuracy and the degree to which the coordinators actually exhibit foresight and ability to predict business accurately. Table 15.14 reports the results of the analysis for the category of Predictive Accuracy.

TABLE 15.14--PREDICTIVE ACCURACY

Group	Mean	Standard	S.E.	F
	Score	Deviation		
Center Directors (ideal)	-0.38	1.24	0.08	50.40
Coordinators (actual)	-0.60	.607		

The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the

coordinators' actual behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the senior directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

#### Category 11: Integration

There was a significant difference at the .01 level in the degree of importance the senior directors identified with the category of integration and the degree to which the coordinators actually maintain a closely-knit organization and resolve intermember conflict. Table 14-13 reports the results of the analysis for the category of integration.

TABLE 14-13--INTEGRATION

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t	Prob.
Senior Directors (ideal)	41.04	4.38	1.38	05-10
Coordinators (actual)	46	3.97		

The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level. This indicates that the coordinators' actual behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the senior directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

#### Category 12: Superior Orientation

There was a significant difference at the .01 level in the degree of importance the senior directors identified with the category of superior orientation and the degree to which the coordinators actually maintain cordial relations with superiors, have influence over them, and are striving for higher status. Table 14-14 reports the results of the analysis for the category of superior orientation. The results indicate that the difference between the two groups was significant at the .01 level.

This indicates that the coordinators' actual behavior was perceived to be more frequent than the leader directors' rating of the ideal behavior.

### Findings

Data from the Leader Behavior Profile and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance with a simple linear regression procedure. The 12 behavior categories were analyzed to ascertain the difference between the "ideal" frequency of leader behavior suggested by the national authorities and the "actual" frequency of leader behavior exhibited by selected community education administrators. The .05 level of significance was used for each of the 12 categories. Findings from this procedure indicate that of the 12 categories, only Tolerance of Uncertainty and Tolerance of Pressure were not significantly different. There was consistency between the "ideal" frequency and the "actual" frequency on both of these categories.

The additional 39 categories were found to be significantly different at the .01 level. The actual behavior of coordinators proved to always be more frequent than the ideal rating indicated by the leader directors.

Thus, findings from the analysis of data in chapter III indicate that personal data variables of experience produced significant differences in three categories, while the personal data variable of training produced a significant difference in only one category. Findings in chapter IV indicate

a significant difference between ideal behavior and actual behavior in 10 of the 12 categories.

In chapter V, the discussion, conclusions, and recommendations concerning the findings reported in Chapters 4(I) and IV will be set forth.



## CHAPTER 8

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

This study was designed to address two questions concerning leader behavior of community education coordinators based on the 12 constructs of Stogdill's taxonomy of leader behavior (Stogdill, 1974). Specifically, the following questions were addressed:

1. Is there a relationship between the "actual" frequency of leader behaviors exhibited by selected community education coordinators and the "ideal" frequency of leader behavior suggested by the national authorities?
2. Is there a relationship between selected personal data variables and the behavior exhibited by selected coordinators based on the 12 dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-LBP?

A sample of 15 community school coordinators within the State of Florida participated in the study. Each coordinator identified five national authority articles deemed representative to provide the LBP--II rating input. Each representative rated the coordinators on the 12 dimensions of the LBP--II.

Scores for each coordinator were obtained and averaged to provide a mean score for each of the 12 subscales.

The coordinators were then grouped according to three personal data variables: sex, age, years experience as a coordinator, training in community education, previous professional experience, and professional applications.

A one-way analysis of variance and Tukey-BSD procedure were used to analyze the 12 subscales for significant differences based on the personal data variables. For the purpose of this analysis, a .05 level of significance was used.

To address the question concerning the "ideal" versus the "actual" leader behavior, a series of national studies was conducted. As a development of the 1989-2011 was used to determine the ideal frequency of leader behavior as perceived by the directors of the Centers for Community Education in 45 colleges and universities in the United States. These data were used to compare the "ideal" behavior with "actual" behavior as recorded by the 1989-2011. A one-way analysis of variance with a single linear regression was used to test for significant differences in each of the 12 subscale categories. For the purpose of this analysis, a .05 level of significance was used.

### Sampling

The process of selecting a sample of coordinators for this study revealed that only 68% of those identified by the sampling process is not here or refuse to say school-community advisory council. The fact that this type of situation exists

suggests two problems. First, there may be a lack of understanding or consistent use of the concept of community involvement in the processes of education at the school or district level. Second, there may exist a perception that community education programs are not part of the "regular" educational program and therefore should not be addressed by school-community advisory councils. Consequently, the leader behavior of participants in this study may not accurately reflect the behaviors of all coordinators in Florida.

The five coordinators who did choose to participate, but failed to return the data, did so for various reasons. Prolonged illness, inability to collect circulated instruments, cancelled council meetings, and disbanding councils all led to the reduced return. In retrospect, the data collection procedures could have been enhanced by the researcher attending advisory council meetings and collecting data in person.

#### LEIS--211 Findings

Respondents to the 108 items of the LEIS--211 provided no significant differences at the .05 level between coordinators when grouped by the variables of sex, age, previous professional experience, and professional aspirations across all 12 sub-scales. The variables of years experience as a coordinator and training in community education were not significant at the .05 level across nine categories and 13 categories respectively. Reasons for these similarities should be discussed.

which, leader skills are demanded, and the way variables behave in community education coordinators. It is suggested that the position of community school coordinator is perceived as an entry level administrative position; thus, a certain level of leader behavior must be observable before an individual becomes a community education coordinator. It may also be concluded that once the individual performs in the role, he or she acquires characteristics which are common to all who function in this role. This is not to suggest that all community education coordinators are alike, however, the findings of the (1989-91) indicate that there are few distinguishable differences in leader behavior among the community education coordinators.

Finally, this study used the perception of school-community advisory council members as the basis for evaluating leader behavior. Since the council group structure affords certain status and function to the role of community education coordinator, there may be expectations on the part of council members for the coordinator to exercise predominant leadership. Both status and function are ascribed to the position and not the individual; hence, the ratings of leader behavior may be based on expectations for the position and not the actual behavior of the individual in that position.

However, the study did reveal some significant differences at the .05 level. When the coordinators were grouped by years experience as a community education coordinator, the coordinators were perceived to exhibit differing degrees of leader

behavior in three categories: Persuasiveness, Initiation of Structure and Superior Achievement.

In the category of Persuasiveness, the coordinators with over six years experience were perceived to use persuasion and argument effectively less often than those coordinators with less than three years experience and those coordinators with three to six years experience. The ability to exhibit strong convictions and use persuasion and argument effectively can be directly related to enthusiasm for one's work. These coordinators with over six years experience all had professional aspirations of becoming school principals, yet had failed to progress from their present position. Lack of enthusiasm and conviction can decrease as the ability to advance professionally is thwarted.

Initiation of Structure was also significantly different when the coordinators were grouped by years experience. These coordinators with three to six years experience in community education were perceived to exhibit behavior which more clearly defined their role and allowed followers to know what is expected of them than those coordinators with less than three years experience and those with more than six years experience. Knowledge of a role and the expected behavior associated with that role develops as a result of expectancy and reinforcement. These coordinators with less than three years may still be developing clarity of role definition and have not yet become facile in communicating to others their expectations. Conversely, those coordinators with more than six years experience

may develop role conflicts as a result of changing values and/or changing demands placed upon them as they assume leadership. The difference in perception of role by the coordinator and others can lead to conflicts and, thus, an inability to successfully assume role with followers.

Likewise, superior orientation was significantly different when the coordinators were grouped by years experience. Each group differed significantly from the others. Those coordinators with over six years experience were perceived to be less concerned with establishing cordial relations with superiors, having influence over them, and striving for higher status than those coordinators with less than three years experience and those with three to six years experience. However, those coordinators with three to six years experience were perceived to be the most concerned with establishing cordial relations with superiors, having influence over them, and striving for higher status. This noticeable difference between the three groups can be related to the professional aspirations of the coordinators. Coordinators new to the position (less than three years) could be still attempting to orient themselves to their role while trying to strive for advancement. Thus, they could exhibit less superior orientation than the three to six year group. Those coordinators in the three to six year group would have had sufficient time to develop security in the position and would be much more inclined to exhibit behaviors indicative of superior orientation in an effort to secure professional advancement. However, those coordinators with over six years

experiments should perceive themselves as professional peers of other individuals and should not be as concerned with trying to influence them as others are higher up.

In addition to these detailed differences, the variable of training provided a significant difference in the category of initiation of structure. Those coordinators with on-the-job training scored somewhat lower on the initiation of structure subscale than those coordinators with academic training and those coordinators with on-the-job training. However, when the more conservative Tukey's procedure was performed, none of the three groups were significantly different from one another. These results would tend to indicate that training and work experience cannot be isolated as variables in this subscale. In-service, academic and on-the-job training do not discriminate clearly for this particular subscale.

The correlation matrix for all variables provided additional information to evaluate these findings. As shown by other studies done by Sergioli, Davis, and Ray (1981, 1984, and 1985) the subscales of the LMQ-III are not independent of one another. Generally, the results suggest that certain categories are influenced strongly by a single subscale while some categories are influenced by more than one. For example, those coordinators scoring high in the category of Consideration, also score high in integration ( $r = .84$ ) and Superior Satisfaction ( $r = .88$ ) while those scoring high in the category Representation, also score high in Consideration ( $r = .84$ ), Superior Status

$r = .7255$  (Spearman  $r = .747$ , integration  $R^2 = .717$ , Self Report of  $r = .644$ , and Facilitation  $r = .653$ ). The findings acquired from this analysis of subscale correlations suggest that Followers are able to describe the coordinator in terms of several factors.

#### Leader Behavior Profile Findings

Responses to the Leader Behavior Profile indicate significant differences at the .05 level between the ideal frequency of leader behavior determined by the national average (114) and the actual frequency of leader behaviors as measured by the LBP-XI on 10 of 12 subscales. Two of the subscales, Tolerance of Uncertainty and Tolerance of Freedom were not significantly different between online disorders and non-disorders. Reasons for these noticeable differences should be researched.

Initially, there seems to be a significant distinction between theory and practice. The professional literature in community education ascribes to the role of coordinator characteristics of a progress facilitator. That is, the role of facilitator or the profile leadership which is to assist a group in learning useful ways for accomplishing tasks and working as a unit. The major factor being to assist group members by guiding decisions. On the other hand, practice, as measured by the LBP-XI, shows that coordinators are decidedly a much more prominent leadership role and taking a direct active part in the decision making process. This is best exemplified by the



difference the category of Solo Initiators. Coordinators are actually actively exercising the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others much more often than the ideal situation would demand.

Secondly, there seems to be a discrepancy between community education philosophy and community member preferences. One of the key components of community education philosophy is the systematic involvement of community members in the educational process. This involvement in decision making lies at the cornerstone of the movement. On the other hand, the open source Gallup Educational Poll (1977) reports that the majority of the people want the educational decisions making to remain with elected officials. This attitude could increase the co-opting-reinforcement factor which would further cement in the position of coordinators as a representation of the administration and school board. Thus, the citizens expect the coordinator to exercise prominent leadership and the coordinator responds by doing so.

Finally, these measurable differences might be a result of the lack of professional training. Of the coordinators participating in this study, only three have had full-time academic training. If there is to be consistency between theory and practice, coordinators should have more in-depth training. These human, technical and conceptual skills upon which community education functions are unique and may not be easily acquired on the job. Individuals who are to exercise low profile leadership must possess specialized process skills which are not

usually taught as traditional admission certificate. Lack of these process leadership skills could create a reliance by the coordinators on traditional and more prominent leadership roles.

### Conclusions

The leader behavior of selected community education coordinators were measured by means of a survey of the perceptions of members of the coordinators' school-community advisory council. The survey covered the 12 dimensions of leader behavior measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire III. Findings from this survey instrument would tend to support the conclusion that there is no significant difference in the perceived leader behavior of community education coordinators based on selected personal data variables.

Answers to the questions posed at the outset of the study can be afforded on the basis of these data:

1. The variable of sex produced no significant difference in the perceived leader behavior of the selected community education coordinators in any of the 12 behavior constructs.
2. The variable of age produced no significant difference in the perceived leader behavior of community education coordinators in any of the 12 behavior constructs.
3. The variable of years experience did produce a significant difference in the perceived behavior of community education coordinators in the construct of Participativeness,

Indicators of Awareness and Superior Education.

There was no significant difference as measured in terms of the other nine constructs.

4. The variable of training in community education provided no significant difference in the perceived behavior of community education coordinators in any of the 12 behavior constructs.
5. The variable of previous professional experience provided no significant difference in the perceived behavior of community education coordinators in any of the 12 behavior constructs.

In addition, a survey of national authorities was conducted to determine the ideal leader behavior of community education coordinators and to ascertain whether the actual behaviors of coordinators as measured by the (1982-83) were consistent with the opinions of the national authorities. Evidence from this comparison would tend to support the conclusion that there are significant differences between the ideal leader behavior suggested by the national authorities and the actual leader behavior exhibited by the community education coordinators. Only two constructs, Tolerance of Uncertainty and Tolerance of Freedom were not significantly different.

### Implications

The findings resulting from this study lend support to the following implications. First, leader behavior and performance of community education coordinators are not related

to the six identified personal variables and thus, these variables are not good predictors of behavior or performance. The use of these variables as selection criteria of individuals to fill community education leadership positions is marginal at best. In addition, these variables should have little significance as criteria for selecting individuals to be trained in community education.

Secondly, there is a significant difference in community education leadership theory and community education leadership practice. This fact has implications not only for the training institutions, but also for the State Department of Education which has responsibility to establish guidelines for the implementation of the Community School Act. The difference in theory and practice may directly reflect a lack of adequate training on the part of those individuals who hold these positions, as well as a lack of sensitivity to the need for simplified training in function in a facilitator manner.

#### Recommendations for Future Study

The following recommendations are offered in an effort to foster the development and growth of community education in Florida as well as to promote the furtherance of knowledge:

1. Studies of community education leadership should be conducted to provide additional data for a more inclusive leadership profile.
2. Additional factors which influence leader behavior should be researched. These might include

personality characteristics, values, and attitudes, as well as specific human, conceptual, and technical skill competencies.

3. The role of the community center in community education leadership should be researched.
4. The role of the school-community advisory council in planning and evaluating community education programs should be researched.
5. Research should be conducted to determine if minimal training requirements are necessary for community education coordinators in the effort to fulfill their role.
6. Current educational programs providing training for community education coordinators should be studied. Specific attention should be paid to the substantive nature of course content, scope and sequence of skill development, and the practical applicability of skills.
7. Studies should be conducted to establish a basic application necessary for community education coordinators. These studies should review the community for an interdisciplinary competency-based approach related to the specific human, conceptual, and technical skills essential for functioning in the role of community education coordinator.

8. Research should be conducted to determine if community education has application as an operational philosophy for community colleges and universities, as well as public schools.
9. A study should be conducted to determine if moving the responsibility for community education from the Department of Education Adult Education Division to the Councilmanor's Cabinet level would foster community educational programming at the four division levels and increase cooperation and coordination among the divisions.
10. Studies should be conducted to determine the feasibility of developing community education consortium training models for use by local school districts in their ongoing staff development programs. The three Centers for Community Education in Florida would provide the necessary resources for the development of these models. The models could then be utilized by both instructional and administrative employees at the local district level.
11. Research should be conducted to determine the most effective method of gaining community input for community needs assessment, program development and evaluation.

12. Studies should be conducted to determine if supervisors who ask his leader behavior which is indicative of the ideal, as suggested by the national authorities, are more effective in performing their role.

APPENDIX A

Dear

I am presently undertaking a study dealing with the leader behaviors of community coalition coordinators. The study would necessitate five members of your community advisory council completing a survey. The administrators of the survey should take no longer than thirty minutes. In addition, a personal data sheet concerning information such as age, race, training, and professional experience would be completed by you.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the enclosed form and return it to me. Upon receipt of the form, I will contact participants by telephone to discuss the research in depth.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

R. L. Schifano

RLS/for  
advisors



## Participation Council Form

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Billing Address \_\_\_\_\_

Office Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_  
(area code)

When can you best often be reached by telephone?

\_\_\_\_\_morning \_\_\_\_\_afternoon \_\_\_\_\_evening

Name of community advisory council chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_

How many council members usually participate in the meetings?

\_\_\_\_\_

When does your council usually meet?

\_\_\_\_\_

I choose not to participate \_\_\_\_\_

Dear

Enclosed are the computer scored questionnaires to be distributed at your next meeting. Please be sure that the chairperson distributes and collects the questionnaires in order that they may be returned to us. Also, please be sure that the personal data sheet is completed with the questionnaire.

I appreciate you taking the time and effort to assist us in the collection of this data. If you have any questions or problems, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A. L. Stefank

ALF:  
enclosures

## LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—FORM 311

Originated by staff members of  
The Ohio State Leadership Studies  
and revised by the  
Bureau of Business Research

## Purpose of the Questionnaire

In the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of the coordinator. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or proficiency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of the selected coordinator.

Note: The term "coordinator" as employed in the following items, refers to the individual who has full-time responsibility for community education at the school center. The term "group" as employed in the following items, refers to a unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described. In some cases the "group" may represent only one or two individuals.

The term "members" refers to all the people in the group that is supervised by the person being described.

Please attempt to answer all the questions.

Published by

Bureau of Business Research  
College of Commerce and Administration  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio

Copyright 1944

# **INSTRUCTIONS:**

- a. **READ each item carefully.**
- b. **THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.**
- c. **FOR THE behavior ratings (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never, select as described by the item.**
- d. **MARK A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.**

A = always

B = often

C = occasionally

D = seldom

E = never

- e. **MARK your selected letter often on the examples below.**

Example: The coordinator often tells us about the-----A B C D E

Example: The coordinator never tells us about the-----A B C D E

Example: The coordinator occasionally tells us about the-----A B C D E

1. The coordinator acts as the spokesman of the group-----A B C D E
2. The coordinator waits patiently for the results of a decision-----A B C D E
3. The coordinator makes up talks to stimulate the group-----A B C D E
4. The coordinator lets group members know what is expected of them-----A B C D E
5. The coordinator allows the members complete freedom in their work-----A B C D E
6. The coordinator is interested about making decisions in the group-----A B C D E
7. The coordinator is friendly and approachable-----A B C D E

is arbitrary.

$B$  = Brian

$C$  = Cassandra

$E$  = Elaine

$F$  = Fran

- 8 The coordinator acknowledges receipt with.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 9 The coordinator sends several requests.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 10 The coordinator gets along well with the people  
about him/her.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 11 The coordinator publishes the activities  
of the group.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 12 The coordinator becomes active when he/she  
cannot find out what is going on.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 13 The coordinator's arguments are convincing.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 14 The coordinator encourages the use of  
certain procedures.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 15 The coordinator permits the members to use their  
own judgment in solving problems.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 16 The coordinator fails to take necessary action.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 17 The coordinator does little things to make it  
pleasant to be a member of the group.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 18 The coordinator views as falling short of completing  
groups.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 19 The coordinator keeps the group working  
together as a team.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 20 The coordinator keeps the group on good  
standing with higher authority.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 21 The coordinator speaks as the representative of  
the group.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 22 The coordinator accepts defeat in giving.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$
- 23 The coordinator argues persuasively for further  
goals of the.....  $B \ C \ D \ E$

- A = Always
- B = Often
- C = Occasionally
- D = Seldom
- E = Never

24. The coordinator tries out his/her ideas in the group.....A B C D E
25. The coordinator encourages initiative in the group members.....A B C D E
26. The coordinator lets other persons take many his/her leadership in the group.....A B C D E
27. The coordinator acts suggestions made by the group into operation.....A B C D E
28. The coordinator needs others for greater efforts.....A B C D E
29. The coordinator seems able to predict what is coming next.....A B C D E
30. The coordinator is working hard for a prize etc.....A B C D E
31. The coordinator speaks for the group when visitors are present.....A B C D E
32. The coordinator accepts delays without becoming upset.....A B C D E
33. The coordinator is a very persuasive talker.....A B C D E
34. The coordinator makes his/her mistakes clear to the group.....A B C D E
35. The coordinator lets the members do their work the way they think best.....A B C D E
36. The coordinator lets new members take advantage of his/her.....A B C D E
37. The coordinator treats all group members as his/her equal.....A B C D E
38. The coordinator keeps the work moving at a rapid pace.....A B C D E
39. The coordinator settles conflicts when they occur in the group.....A B C D E
40. The coordinator's opinions are favorable to most of his/her suggestions.....A B C D E

B = Afraid

B = Ofen

C = Does loudly

D = Is like

E = Never

- 41 The coordinator represents the group as  
visible members..... B C D E
- 42 The coordinator becomes anxious when talking  
for the group..... B C D E
- 43 The coordinator is very skilled in an argument..... B C D E
- 44 The coordinator decides what shall be done  
and how it shall be done..... B C D E
- 45 The coordinator assigns a task, then lets  
the members handle it..... A B C D E
- 46 The coordinator is the leader of the  
group in some way..... A B C D E
- 47 The coordinator gives advance notice of changes..... A B C D E
- 48 The coordinator pushes for increased production..... A B C D E
- 49 Things usually take out as he/she speaks..... A B C D E
- 50 The coordinator enjoys the privileges of his/her  
position..... A B C D E
- 51 The coordinator handles complex problems efficiently..... A B C D E
- 52 The coordinator is able to tolerate disagreement  
and controversy..... A B C D E
- 53 The coordinator is not a very convincing speaker..... A B C D E
- 54 The coordinator assigns group members to  
particular tasks..... A B C D E
- 55 The coordinator treats the members loose as a  
job, and lets them go to it..... A B C D E
- 56 The coordinator looks down upon his/her rights  
to stand firm..... A B C D E
- 57 The coordinator keeps in himself/herself..... B C D E

- A = Always
- B = Often
- C = Sometimes
- D = Seldom
- E = Never

88. The coordinator asks the members to work hard when needed. A B C D E
89. The coordinator is accurate in predicting the  
trend of events. A B C D E
90. The coordinator gets his/her superior to act  
for the welfare of the group members. A B C D E
91. The coordinator gets exempted by details. A B C D E
92. The coordinator can wait just as long, then blows up. A B C D E
93. The coordinator speaks from a strong inner conviction. A B C D E
94. The coordinator makes sure that his/her part in the  
group is understood by the group members. A B C D E
95. The coordinator is reluctant to allow the members  
any freedom of action. A B C D E
96. The coordinator lets some members have authority  
that he/she should have. A B C D E
97. The coordinator looks out for the personal  
welfare of the group members. A B C D E
98. The coordinator permits the members to take in  
what is their opinion. A B C D E
99. The coordinator sees to it that the work of the  
group is understood. A B C D E
100. The coordinator's work carries weight with  
his/her superiors. A B C D E
101. The coordinator gets things all mixed up. A B C D E
102. The coordinator remains calm when surprised  
about coming events. A B C D E
103. The coordinator is an inspiring colleague. A B C D E



A = Always

B = Often

C = Sometimes

D = Never

E = Never

- 74 The coordinator schedules the work to be done.....A B C D E
- 75 The coordinator allows the group a high degree of latitude.....A B C D E
- 76 The coordinator takes full charge when emergency arises.....A B C D E
- 77 The coordinator is willing to take charge.....A B C D E
- 78 The coordinator drives hard when there is a job to be done.....A B C D E
- 79 The coordinator helps group members settle their differences.....A B C D E
- 80 The coordinator gets along better with his team than his superior.....A B C D E
- 81 The coordinator can refuse a request to assist and order.....A B C D E
- 82 The coordinator is able to delay action until the proper time occurs.....A B C D E
- 83 The coordinator persuades others that his/her ideas are in their interests.....A B C D E
- 84 The coordinator sets high definite standards of performance.....A B C D E
- 85 The coordinator trusts the members to exercise good judgment.....A B C D E
- 86 The coordinator overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership.....A B C D E
- 87 The coordinator refuses to explain his/her actions.....A B C D E
- 88 The coordinator urges the group to meet its previous record.....A B C D E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Never

E = Lower

- 82 The coordinator anticipates problems and plans for them.....A B C D E
- 83 The coordinator is working his/her way to the top.....A B C D E
- 84 The coordinator gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her.....A B C D E
- 85 The coordinator worries about the outcome of any new procedure.....A B C D E
- 86 The coordinator can inspire enthusiasm for a project.....A B C D E
- 87 The coordinator asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.....A B C D E
- 88 The coordinator punishes the group to get his own point.....A B C D E
- 89 The coordinator is easily recognized as the leader of the group.....A B C D E
- 90 The coordinator acts without consulting the group.....A B C D E
- 91 The coordinator keeps the group working up to capacity.....A B C D E
- 92 The coordinator maintains a closely held group.....A B C D E
- 93 The coordinator maintains control relations with superiority.....A B C D E

APPENDIX B

Personal Data

1. I am \_\_\_\_\_ male \_\_\_\_\_ female
2. I am in the age group \_\_\_\_\_ 21-30, \_\_\_\_\_ 31-40, \_\_\_\_\_ 41 and over
3. I have been in community education \_\_\_\_\_ years (list first 3 years, \_\_\_\_\_ 4 to 6 years, \_\_\_\_\_ over 6 years)
4. I received my community education training through  
\_\_\_\_\_ participation in an academic community education training program  
\_\_\_\_\_ participation in a two-week workshop  
\_\_\_\_\_ participation in in-service workshops  
\_\_\_\_\_ participation in a full year internship  
\_\_\_\_\_ supervised field experience  
\_\_\_\_\_ on the job training with little academic training  
\_\_\_\_\_ other \_\_\_\_\_
5. Prior to entering community education work, my experience was in:  
\_\_\_\_\_ elementary schools  
\_\_\_\_\_ secondary schools  
\_\_\_\_\_ other (please list) \_\_\_\_\_
6. The next professional position to which I aspire is \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C

I am presently conducting a study dealing with the nature of leadership behaviors of community education coordinators. The initial phase of the study requires basic data for a behavioral profile. Each Center Director is being asked to provide input for the development of the profile.

I would appreciate your taking just five minutes from your busy schedule to complete the short survey enclosed. Please return in the self-addressed envelope at your earliest possible convenience.

Thank you for your immediate attention and cooperation.

Sincerely,

A. L. Spafarak  
Center Director

Attn:  
Enclatures

### Leader Behavior Description Profile

The following list of items describes possible leader behaviors of community education coordinators. Each item is a descriptive category of various behaviors and should be rated according to importance in relation to success of effectiveness. Read each category carefully and think about how relatively important the behaviors indicated by the descriptions would be for a coordinator to be effective in community education leadership.

#### INSTRUCTIONS:

- Column A -- of the twelve categories, check the one you consider most important
  
- Column B -- of the nine categories identified in column A, check the one you consider to be most important
  
- Column C -- of the six categories identified in column B, check the three you consider most important
  
- Column D -- of the three categories identified in column C, check the one you consider most important

Behavior Category	A	B	C	D
1. Representative--speaks and acts as a representative of the group				
2. Demote reconciliation--reconciles conflicting organizational demands and reduces disorder in the system				
3. Tolerance of uncertainty--able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset				
4. Persuasive--persuades persuasion and argument attractively; exhibits strong convictions				
5. Initiation of structure--clearly defines own role, and lays followers down what is expected				
6. Tolerance of freedom--allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action				
7. Role definition--actively re-analyzes leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others				
8. Consideration--regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers				
9. Production emphasis--applies pressure for productive output				
10. Productive advice--exhibits knowledge and ability to provide accurate advice				
11. Ingroup behavior--applies a strongly self-organized, resolves internal conflict				
12. Influence with superiors--maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence with them, serves as higher status				

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, W. & Davis, D. A. Diagnosis of educational leadership. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Argyle, J. Understanding the individual and the organization. New York: Wiley, 1957.
- Barnard, C. I. The functions of the supervisor. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Barnard, C. Report on the conditions and improvement of the public schools of Rhode Island. In J. A. Bronckhorst Ed., Henry Barnard as educator. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931.
- Bass, B. M. Leadership, psychology and organizational behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.
- Bassin, W. E. Changing organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1944.
- Barnard, C. I. An introduction to social psychology. New York: Holt, 1938.
- Barridge, B. E. Its achievement. In W. M. Pichon, C. Bartolucci & J. Bannister (Eds.), The role of the school in community education. Midland, Michigan: Fordell Publishing Co., 1949.
- Barridge, B. E. The community education handbook. Midland, Michigan: Fordell Publishing Co., 1952.
- Bird, C. Social psychology. New York: Appleton-Century, 1948.
- Brown, A. F. Assistant in leadership. Educational administration quarterly, 1953, 3, 48-73.
- Campbell, E. S. Community schools: Their administration. In W. M. Pichon, C. Bartolucci & J. Bannister (Eds.), The role of the school in community education. Midland, Michigan: Fordell Publishing Co., 1949.
- Cornwright, B. & Bender, A. Group dynamics: Research and theory. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson & Co., 1951.
- Davis, J. B. Leadership and organizations. Individuals and Social Research, 1953, 37, 502-513.

- Cartel, R. B. New concepts for making up leadership in terms of group identity. Human Relations, 1958, 1, 141-154
- Clancy, P. L. Testimony presented before the Labor and Education Committee of the United States House of Representatives, January 26, 1949, and the Subcommittee on Education of the United States Senate Committee on Public Labor and Welfare, January 29, 1949.
- Clapp, L. A. Community schools in action. New York: Viking Press, 1955
- Clark, P. A., & Blish, R. B. Life-learning education. Richmond, Michigan: Pastall Publishing Co., 1972.
- Clark, P. A., & Staferak, R. L. Leadership for change. Community Education Journal, November-December 1976, 2, 141, 187-187
- Cobb, L. A. Schools and community. In W. G. Monroe Old J., The encyclopedia of educational research. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949
- Cronkleton, L. G. Learning schools: New approaches in aid action. Columbia, MO: Carter McPitt, 1979
- Dashler, R., & Smith, J. L. School involvement: Evaluation in the revolution. The Delta Register, November 1977, 1, 126
- Deary, J., & Sawyer, E. Schools of tomorrow. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1942.
- Dewey, J. Control in human societies. New York: Appleton-Century, 1918
- Dewey, J. The community school. New York: E. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1938
- Flint Community Schools. Flint community schools: Guidelines for school-community advisory councils. Flint, Michigan: The Community Schools, 1973.
- Gallup, G. B. What about Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. The Delta Register, September 1977, 22, 115, 21-48
- Gibb, L. A. Leadership. In W. G. Monroe Old J., Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1964
- Grays, R. A. An examination of the leader behavior of community agencies directors in the advisory council (doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1975). [University Microfilms No. 35-27, 128].



- Balpin, A. M. The leadership behavior of school superintendents. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1934.
- Balpin, A. M. The leader behavior and effectiveness of school superintendents. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: its description and measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1937.
- Balpin, A. M. The leadership behavior of school superintendents. Chicago: Illinois Educational Center University of Illinois, 1938.
- Balpin, A. M. Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillan, 1944.
- Balpin, A. M., & Riner, R. J. A factorial study of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: its description and measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1937.
- Bart, J. B. The discovery of intelligence. New York: The Century Co., 1924.
- Barghille, J. B. Leader behavior description. Columbus: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board, 1936.
- Barghille, J. B. Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college deans. The Journal of Educational Psychology, November 1935, 26 (7), 383-387.
- Barghille, J. B., & Connel, A. E. Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: its description and measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Personnel Research, 1937.
- Beckham, S. P. Situational behavioral approach to leadership. In L. G. Cunningham & J. Geyser (Eds.), Leadership, the science and the art today. 19th Annual Phi Delta Kappa Symposium on Educational Research. Chicago, Illinois: Pearson Publishers, 1933.
- Bennis, W. C. The human group. New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1933.
- Beuk, J. W. Leader behavior of the secondary school principal. National Association of Secondary School Principals, The Educator, 1948, 49, 32-37.
- Beukins, W. B. A review of leadership studies with particular reference to military problems. Psychological Bulletin, 1947, 53, 54-79.
- Bevington, F. W. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1943.

- Stinson, C. C. A study of the skills of successful directors of community education in Michigan (Unpublished dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1974). (University Microfilms No. 36-28, 840)
- State of Florida. Chapter 35-518, Section 518.10, subsection 1. State of Florida, Department of Education, Tallahassee, 1973
- Tucker, A. The young organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949
- Watts, E. E. The development of public school adult education. Public School Adult Education. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Public School Adult Education, 1954
- Webster, F. Leadership and motivation. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1958
- Wells, E. D. Approaches to role change in community education. Phi Delta Kappan, November 1973, 33 (5), 174-178
- Winters, Jack H., & Lefarin, C. Community education. From program to principle. Midland, Michigan: PERCOTT PUBLICATIONS Co., 1971
- Wittell, F. B. Analysis of the perceptions of the role of the administrator and superintendent with respect to authority, responsibility and selection in the community schools of Flint in the attendance center level (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973). (University Microfilms No. 72-15, 1981)
- Woods, R. E. Organizational and administrative problems and provisions. Phi Delta Kappan, November 1973, 33 (5), 166-170
- Wright, R. C. J. The Flint community school concept as it was in. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1959, 3, 141-151
- Wright, A. B. A study of the leadership process. American Sociological Review, 1941, 6, 674-682
- Wright, E. E. The community education coordinator. Community Education Journal, November 1974, 3 (3), 34-35
- Yess, E. G. School and community. New York: Franklin-Hall, Inc., 1945
- Yess, E. G. Organizational behavior in schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968
- Yess, Richard M. School community integration. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1975

- Schneider, J. The cultural situation as a condition for the achievement of mass american sociology. Review, 1937, 1, 448-451.
- Smy, R. P. The community school emphasis in post war education in R. B. Smy (Ed.), american education in the post war period, curriculum reconstructions. Paris-Toronto, Teachers of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Smy, R. P., & Associates. Community education: A conceptual approach. Michigan: Randall Publishing Co., 1945.
- Sturges, E. J. Differences between personnel administrative for teacher and role norms as factors in leadership evaluation and group morale. Administrative Science, 1954, 18, 57.
- Stogdill, R. M. Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology, 1948, 25, 19-21.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. Individual behavior and group achievement. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Stogdill, R. M. Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire--Form III, an experimental revision. Columbia, MO: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University, 1949.
- Stogdill, R. M. A review of research on leader behavior description questionnaire--Form III. Columbia, MO: Ohio State University, College of Administrative Science, 1950.
- Stogdill, R. M. Patterns of leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1954.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, G. S., & May, R. B. The leader behavior of unpaid labor leaders. Journal of Psychology, 1941, 26, 3-8.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, G. S., & May, R. B. The leader behavior of presidents of labor unions. Personnel Psychology, 1944, 12, 46-52.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, G. S., & May, R. B. The leader behavior of university presidents. Columbia: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, unpublished report, 1945.
- Wells, W. F., & Kealey, F. J. The community school basic concepts, functions, and organization. Detroit, Michigan: United Education Council, 1949.

- Waller, J. E. The relationship between the personality characteristics, personal factors, and effectiveness of community school directors (Unpublished dissertation, 1968, State University, 1971). (University Microfilms No. 78-41893)
- Weaver, J. Strategies for training community education leaders. Community Education Journal, Nov-Dec 1976, 2 (3) 45-47
25. 13

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Albert Edward (Al) Seaford, son of Albert and Lillian Seaford, was born in Ocean Beach, Florida, January 22, 1945. He graduated from Ocean High School in 1963.

He received the degree of Bachelor of Arts with a major in elementary education in December of 1969. He completed his graduate studies at the University of South Florida and received a Master of Arts degree in early childhood education in December of 1975. During his graduate work, he was awarded a graduate assistantship for gifted education as administrator of the gifted child enrichment program. He also served as president of Sigma Xi, Honor Society and participated in numerous educational seminars and conferences.

In September 1970, he began his teaching career in the Hillsborough County public school system. After two successful years of classroom teaching, he was promoted to an administrator in the community education-adult education program, serving as an assistant principal.

He continued that position until June of 1979. During that time, he was president of the Florida Association for the Gifted and a member of Phi Delta Kappa.

He moved to Gainesville, Florida, in August of 1979 to begin his doctoral studies in educational administration and

experience at the University of Florida. He maintained a  
 graduate membership in the Center for Community Education.  
 After his internship experience with the president of the  
 National Council for Resource Development of the American  
 Association of Community and Junior Colleges, he served as the  
 center's grant consultant, and in that capacity, he wrote five  
 funded grants totaling over one hundred thousand dollars.  
 Following in 1971, he was promoted to the position of Center  
 Associate.

He has held professional positions as president-elect of  
 Phi Delta Kappa, consultant for resource development, member  
 of the Education and Training Committee of the Voluntary Action  
 Council, member of the Regional Council for Resource Develop-  
 ment, and a member of the Florida Association of Community  
 Education.

His is married to the former Betty Lammie (Betty) Barkin  
 of Tampa, Florida. She is a reading specialist and a teacher  
 trainer in the public school system.

Currently, he is Assistant Officer for District Resource  
 Development at Four Hills-Belmont Community College District in  
 Los Altos Hills, California.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
WILLIAM C. CLARK, Chairman  
Associate Professor of  
Educational Administration  
and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
JOHN L. MCWHORTER  
Professor of Educational  
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
ARTHUR J. LEWIS  
Professor of Educational  
Research, Supervision and  
Instruction Division

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy.

December, 1977

---

Dean, Graduate School



experience at the University of Florida. He maintained a  
 graduate membership in the Center for Community Education.  
 After his internship experience with the president of the  
 National Council for Resource Development of the American  
 Association of Community and Junior Colleges, he served as the  
 center's grant consultant, and in that capacity, he wrote five  
 funded grants totaling over one hundred thousand dollars.  
 Following in 1971, he was promoted to the position of Center  
 Associate.

He has held professional positions as president-elect of  
 Phi Delta Kappa, consultant for resource development, member  
 of the Education and Training Committee of the Voluntary Action  
 Council, member of the Regional Council for Resource Develop-  
 ment, and a member of the Florida Association of Community  
 Education.

His is married to the former Betty Louise (Betty) Barkin  
 of Tampa, Florida. She is a reading specialist and a teacher  
 trainer in the public school system.

Currently, he is Assistant Officer for District Resource  
 Development at Foothill-Santa Ana Community College District in  
 Los Alamitos, California.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
WILLIAM C. CLARK, Chairman  
Associate Professor of  
Educational Administration  
and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
JOHN L. MCWHORTER  
Professor of Educational  
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
ARTHUR J. LEWIS  
Professor of Educational  
Research, Supervision and  
Instruction Division

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy.

December, 1977

---

Dean, Graduate School